

Gorbachev: World must follow through Madrid

SOUSTONS, France (R) — Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said Thursday the Madrid peace conference had broken the ice between Middle East foes but the international community must follow it up to ensure peace in the region. "The ice was broken, we hope it will be completely broken," he told reporters in southwest France on his way back from Madrid where he and U.S. President George Bush opened the talks. He said negotiations between Israel and its Arab neighbours would take a long time. "The international community must react to new developments," he said. French President François Mitterrand, who hosted Mr. Gorbachev's 20-hour visit to France, said he had wanted the United Nations and its Security Council to play a bigger role in the conference co-sponsored by Washington and Moscow. "But since the conference is there, we must help it," he added. "We fully wish to see it succeed."

SPECIAL EDITION

LIBRARY OF JORDAN
SERIALS
DIVISION

79993
490

Jordan Times

An independent Arab political daily published by the Jordan Press Foundation

جordan Times يومية سياسية مستقلة عن المؤسسة الصحفية الأردنية - الرأي

Volume 16 Number 4843

AMMAN FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1991, RABIE' AL THANI 24, 1412

Price: Jordan 100 fils; Saudi Arabia 1.50 riyals; UAE 1.50 dirhams

Mideast presents its case in Madrid

Jordan: No peace without land and recognition of Palestinian rights

Israel: Talk of territorial compromise will undermine peace process

Syria: Every inch of Israeli-occupied Arab territory should be returned

Palestinians: Ours is a story of tortured land and proud yet captive people

Lebanon: Israeli occupation of southern strip is like the loss of a vital limb

Jordan seeks just peace — Abu Jaber

MADRID (AP) — Jordan's Foreign Minister Kamel Abu Jaber Thursday urged the Israelis to relinquish occupied territories and the Arabs to end the radicalism that has marred their policies for decades.

Dr. Abu Jaber, speaking after Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir at the U.S.-arranged Middle East peace conference, urged the participants to work for "the dawn of a new era to rectify the mistakes of the past."

At a news conference held later, Dr. Abu Jaber rejected Mr. Shamir's request to hold the next phase of the peace process — bilateral talks — in the Middle East, including meetings in Israel.

"Why should we agree to move the venue?" he said. "The momentum in Madrid is good, and the spirit in Madrid is good, and we should keep it here."

Arab delegations reject any step that would imply recognition of Israel, such as travelling there for meetings, unless there is already substantial progress towards peace accords and the return of occupied territories.

In his speech, he said Jordan's "quest is for an honourable peace that would enable our peoples to tear down the walls of fear and hatred, as people tore down the Berlin Wall."

He argued emotionally that Arabs need feel no guilt for the historical sufferings of the Jewish people and had themselves paid a heavy and undeserved price for them.

"The world and the Israelis themselves know and are aware of our innocence of the crimes against the Jewish people," he said.

"God only knows the price we continue to pay for the sins of others," he said.

"Our land, our culture, our people, even our very souls, as well as everything we hold dear and sacred, continue to be plundered and distorted to accommodate new realities and manufactured facts, brutally created on the ground," Dr. Abu Jaber said in a clear reference to Israeli settlements in the occupied territories.

The chief of the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to the conference referred to the Palestinians' quest for an independent state. He said the Palestinians "have a just cause which must be addressed and resolved with equity and fairness."

He stressed that "the Palestinians must be allowed to exercise their right of self-determination in their ancestral homeland."

Responding to radical Israeli claims that Jordan was the Palestinians' homeland, he said: "Jordan has never been Palestine and will never be so."

Dr. Abu Jaber, a political science professor spoke for 30 minutes, the same length as Mr. Shamir's speech, although they had been allotted 45 minutes to present their case.

The surprise in Dr. Abu Jaber's speech (Continued from page 2)



Foreign Minister Kamel Abu Jaber, head of the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation attending the Madrid Middle East peace conference, Thursday delivers Jordan's address at the meeting

Grim Israeli leader listens as Palestinians cry freedom

MADRID (Agencies) — The Palestinians mounted the world stage at a historic Middle East peace conference Thursday with an emotional plea to Israel for freedom and a state of their own.

After decades of exile, dispersion, war and occupation, a Palestinian leader was admitted to recount the misery of life under occupation as grim-faced Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir sat bristling in the glare of publicity.

"We, the people of Palestine, stand before you in the fulness of our pain, our pride and our anticipation for we have long harboured a yearning for peace and a dream of justice and freedom," said Haider Abdul Shafiq.

"We seek neither an admission of guilt for the past nor vengeance for past inequities, but an act of will that will make peace a reality," Dr. Abdul Shafiq said.

That leadership, he said, is "the symbol of our national unity and identity — the guardian of our past, the protector of our present, and the hope of our future," an indirect reference to the PLO which was excluded from the conference at Israel's insistence.

He argued emotionally that Arabs need feel no guilt for the historical sufferings of the Jewish people and had themselves paid a heavy and undeserved price for them.

Mr. Shamir was not interested in implementing the United Nations land-for-peace resolution — the basis of the conference sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker says multilateral negotiations between Israel, its immediate Arab neighbours and other states in the Middle East on such matters as arms control, water, economic development, the environment and refugees would start within two weeks.

Mr. Shamir said Israel was only interested in the multilateral negotiations, and not in the bilateral talks focused on its occupation of Arab lands.

"It is only interested in entering negotiations with countries of the region on regional cooperation to legitimise its occupation of Arab territories, something which contradicts the objectives for which this conference was called," he said.

Mr. Shamir said that Syria had come to the conference determined to work for a peaceful, just and comprehensive settlement "that would liberate our land, ensure the national rights of the Palestinian people and security."

He used his speech to press the Arabs to conduct the Middle East peace conference's planned second phase, face-to-face separate talks between Israel and the

However, he later made an overt reference to the PLO, saying: "We, the Palestinian people, made the imaginative leap in the Palestine National Council of November 1988, during which the Palestine Liberation Organisation launched its peace initiative..."

Mr. Shamir sat grimly through the speech, sometimes with closed eyes and sometimes fidgeting, and passed a note back to Deputy Foreign Minister Benjamin Netanyahu seconds after the reference.

Dr. Abdul Shafiq said the Palestinians will not settle for anything short of an independent state, but in the interim will accept autonomy in the territories occupied by Israel in the 1967 war.

"Christians, Muslims and Jews face the challenge of heralding a new era enshrined in global values of democracy, human rights, freedom, justice and security," he said.

The 40-minute address drew long applause from the Arab war.

(Continued from page 2)

Israel cites 'history' and says it wants to discuss more than land

MADRID (Agencies) — Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir on Thursday urged his Arab foes to negotiate peace with the Jewish state, and said limiting the talks to territorial concessions would doom the peace process.

"We know our partners to the negotiations will make territorial demands on Israel," he said, but "it will be regrettable if the talks focus primarily and exclusively on territory. It is the quickest way to an impasse."

The Arab delegates are seeking the return of the territory occupied by Israel during the 1967 Middle East war. Syria, in particular, has indicated it might quit the peace unless it regains sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

Mr. Shamir said his country felt "a hunger for peace," after decades of conflict.

"Wars have not solved anything in our region," said Mr. Shamir.

He used his speech to press the Arabs to conduct the Middle East peace conference's planned second phase, face-to-face separate talks between Israel and the

other delegations, in the Middle East.

"There is no better way to make peace than to talk in each other's home," he said. "We invite our partners to this process to come to Israel for the first round of talks. On our part, we are ready to go to Jordan, to Lebanon and to Syria for the same purpose."

The Arabs prefer to remain initially in Madrid, rather than immediately come on Israel the recognition that would be implied by visits to the Jewish state.

Foreign Minister Kamel Abu Jaber rejected Mr. Shamir's invitation, saying "there is a danger of disrupting the whole momentum of the conference and killing its spirit" if it is moved from Madrid.

Delegates have been unable to agree since the conference opened Wednesday on where to hold the bilateral talks, though an initial round is expected to begin Sunday in Madrid.

Mr. Shamir opened his speech with "shalom," the Hebrew greeting that also means "peace" and said "there will be obstacles,

Next week's one-on-one talks between Israel and the Palestinians (Continued on page 3).

Arabs see Shamir speech as overwhelmingly negative

Combined agency despatches

MADRID — Arabs criticised Israel's speech to the Middle East peace conference Thursday as overwhelmingly negative because it offered no concessions on the occupied territories.

Jordanians, Syrians and Palestinians said Mr. Shamir's speech showed the 76-year-old former Jewish guerrilla had not come to the historic talks to seek real peace.

Foreign Minister Kamel Abu Jaber expressed regret over the contents of Mr. Shamir's address and said he had hoped to hear Mr. Shamir speaking about the future and about the achievements of peace in the Middle East rather than about history.

Dr. Abu Jaber, who heads the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to the Madrid talks, asked why did the parties come to Madrid if the Israeli prime minister

refuses to talk about a withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and about the rights of the Palestinian people whose rights are denied by the Jewish state.

Speaking at a press conference Dr. Abu Jaber said that Mr. Shamir accuses the Arabs of rejecting its existence but no one seems to know exactly Israel's borders.

The foreign minister said Jordan is keen on having a new vision from Israel, which, he said, should avoid clichés of the past and should seek a just peace for all sides.

"He did not mention withdrawal. If it is not territory that matters then what are we talking about?" he told reporters in the palace's Hall of Columns where Mr. Shamir's address ended to round silence from Arab delegations.

Referring to Mr. Shamir's call to transfer the talks from Madrid (Continued on page 6)

Lebanon invokes U.N. Resolution 425, urges Israeli pullout

MADRID (Agencies) — Comparing the occupation of any of its land to the loss of "a vital limb," Lebanon Thursday used its voice at historic Middle East peace talks to call for Israel's withdrawal from southern Lebanon.

Lebanese Foreign Minister Fares Bweiz invoked U.N. Security Council Resolution 425 in the renewed push by his government to get Israel out of a 1,000-square-kilometre strip along Israel's northern borders.

The removal of Israel from the Jewish state's self-declared "security zone," — Carved out by Israel in 1985 following its invasion of Lebanon is to be the main issue in talks between the two countries.

He said he had hoped Mr. Shamir would offer the gesture Arab participants were seeking — a freeze on settlements in the occupied territories.

"I was disappointed that Shamir did not throw down a gauntlet or roll the ball into the enemy's court. I expected him to say 'we will freeze settlements,'" Mr. Sarid added.

Opposition member of parliament Heim Oron of the socialist Mapam Party said Mr. Shamir made no mention of Jewish settlements in occupied territories only to appease Washington, Israel's main ally and financial backer.

The Shamir government's enthusiastic drive to expand Jewish settlement in the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem has antagonised Washington and deeply strained ties.

"The Americans are the organisers of this conference but they are also its censors. There is no doubt the speeches passed under the hands of the Americans," Mr. Oron told Israel Television.

Mr. Bweiz also said Lebanon was "committed to the Palestinian cause" and wants Israel to relinquish of occupied lands and east Jerusalem.

Gorbachev says cold war end offers chance for Mideast peace

FOLLOWING are extracts from a speech by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to the Madrid Middle East conference Oct. 30 (unofficial translation):

... The composition of the participants as well as the nature and objectives of this conference are eloquent testimony to the fact that we are participants in an event of major importance in new world politics. The road to this point was strewn with thousands of victims, with devastations and calamities suffered by whole peoples. It was marred by hatred and atrocities, and many were the crossroads on the path that were fraught with danger of global conflagration.

This conflict, the longest in the latter half of the 20th century, bears the heavy stamp of the so-called cold war, and it was not until an end was put to that, that ending this conflict became a tangible possibility, too.

... I must say a few words about the role of the two powers whose presidents are now before you as co-chairmen of the conference.

It was the will of history that without an improvement and then a radical change in Soviet-U.S. relations we would never have witnessed the profound qualitative changes in the world that now make it possible to speak in terms of an entirely new age, an age of peace in world history. Movement in that direction has begun. And it is only in this context that we can understand the fact that a tangible hope has emerged for an Arab-Israeli settlement.

Cooperation between the two powers and other members of the U.N. Security Council was indispensable in order to stop the aggression against Kuwait and to reaffirm the viability to a new criteria in international relations.

Directly after that, just as was agreed between President Bush and myself in

September 1990 at our Helsinki meeting on the subject of the Gulf war, vigorous joint efforts began aimed at achieving a Middle East settlement.

All that we and the Americans have undertaken to that end signifies the right conclusions have been drawn from the Gulf war. Our joint participation in the process of settlement was prompted by a desire to offer our good offices, not any desire to impose solutions from outside that would run counter to the national interests of states in the region.

... Today we have a unique opportunity, and it would be unforgivable to miss this opportunity. Success is in everybody's interest, not only because the rights of the peoples and nations and of the individual are increasingly recognised today as the universal foundation for our world order.

But also for another reason of particular urgency and gravity, and that is the fact that the Middle East has become one of the most heavily armed regions in the world, where lethal weapons and nuclear technologies are building up, and where other weapons of mass destruction are also to be found.

There is justified cause for alarm. The international community is entitled to expect that this conference will come up with decisions that will put this concern to rest.

In my view, the conference can only succeed if no one seeks any victory for one side over the other but all seek a shared victory over a cruel past. I'm speaking of peace rather than mainly a cessation of the state of war, and a durable peace implies the implementation of and respect for the rights of the Palestinian people.

U.S. is protecting its own interests in Madrid — China

PEKING (R) — China's army newspaper said on Thursday that the Middle East peace conference was aimed at in part at protecting U.S. strategic interests.

This was the only controversial comment, however, in official media coverage that has been extremely low key.

While the Madrid peace conference is front-page news in most of the world, China's Communist Party newspaper reported it on page seven on Thursday.

The low-key coverage represents a wait-and-see attitude where Peking thinks it can benefit no matter what the conference turns out, diplomats said.

"China's in almost a no-lose situation," said one envoy. "Without having to get intimately involved in such a sensitive issue, it can still try to have better relations with all parties concerned, including Israel."

"They don't want to be in the

Palestinians issue emotional appeal

(Continued from page 1)

he said.

Dr. Abdul Shafiq appealed to the United States and the Soviet Union, who are sponsoring the peace talks, not to give up their work for peace.

"Our homeland has never ceased to exist in our minds and hearts, but it has to exist as a state on all the territories occupied by Israel in the war of 1967, with Jerusalem as its capital," Dr. Abdul Shafiq declared.

Calling the Israeli occupation of territories taken in 1967 illegal, Dr. Abdul Shafiq lambasted Israeli "cruelty" and praised the Palestinian uprising that has raged in the territories for nearly four years.

He said the Palestinians had an inalienable right to self-determination.

"As we speak, thousands of our brothers and sisters are languishing in Israeli prisons and detention camps ... guilty only of seeking freedom and daring to defy the occupation: set them free..."

"As we speak, the eyes of thousands of Palestinian refugees, deportees and displaced persons since 1967, are haunting us, for exile is a cruel fate: set them free..."

The settlements must stop now. Peace cannot be waged while ... the status of the occupied territories is being decided each day by Israeli bulldozers and barbed wire."

Confidence-building measures like these would prove Israel was willing to negotiate in good faith, he added.

It was an emotional occasion

We have restored diplomatic relations with Israel. Now that deep-rooted democratic changes are taking place in our country and in the world, and now that a real process towards settling the Middle East crisis is getting underway, the absence of relations with Israel was becoming senseless.

We hope, and we'll try to make sure that this will be a benefit to the peoples of our two countries and the entire Arab World. Peace in the Middle and Near East would benefit all. The region has vast potential. Turned to constructive pursuits, it will help not only to resolve the problems of the nations that live there, but will also become an important pillar of support for global, international progress and prosperity. We must break the fetters of the past, and do away with hostility, militarism, terrorism, hostage taking, and those actions that turn people into refugees.

The acceleration of historical evolution when based on democracy is truly amazing. The tremendous social energy of the masses of people is being released. And typical of the way this is made manifest is the dramatic growth of national self-awareness and national consolidation, particularly where national feelings were long ignored or suppressed.

... Yet dangers do exist, and we're already facing such dangers: somewhat unexpectedly, they've made themselves more strongly felt in Europe. But this entirely new international environment means that there's a much lesser temptation for any outsiders to exploit, say, the Yugoslav crisis in order to gain some advantage and strengthen their own hand at other's expense.

On the contrary, the dominant tendency is to exert joint and vigorous efforts to help overcome the crisis, while re-



Mikhail Gorbachev

specting the right of the parties involved to decide the future destiny of their country, and at the same time reminding them of their responsibility to the international community.

... We see both in our country and elsewhere, even here at this conference room, ghosts of the old thinking sometimes unnoticed are still present among us. When we rid ourselves of their presence we will be better able to move towards a new world order, and irrespective of our individual vision of this new order, it appears that we should now promote this objective process itself, relying on the relevant mechanisms of the United Nations, the CSCE, the European Community, modernise old and completely new structures of regional security and cooperation, as well as the institutions created for crisis prevention and conflict settlement.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is for the delegations directly participating in the conference to sort out the details of this enormous task. As co-chairman of the conference we will be in regular contact with our American counterparts, and we will do our utmost to find solutions for which your peoples and the entire world have long been yearning.

... I wish you every success.

Abu Jaber

(Continued from page 1)

ber's address was self-criticism of Arab policies during the past decades of conflict with Israel. That was in sharp contrast with Mr. Shamir's address, blaming the Arabs solely for the Middle East's tragedies.

Speaking in English, Dr. Abu Jaber noted His Majesty King Hussein's record of moderation. Dr. Abu Jaber regretted that since 1947 the Arabs had refused to accommodate peace with Israel "out of a sense of outrage and feelings of injustice and betrayal."

He said: "Over the decades of the thirties, forties and beyond, indeed until the present moment, the arena was abandoned to the radicals."

"In the clash of ideas, visions and armies that have ensued since then, reason, often humanity itself, was pushed beyond the frontiers of choice."

But he added: "If this conference does anything, it must end Israel's self-righteous attitude to live by its own rules alone."

Dr. Abu Jaber said: "To continue to be locked in the mental straitjacket of absolute ideologies means that there will never be a way out of the shackles of death."

The settlement Jordan was seeking, he said, "is a permanent one, just and comprehensive — peace that will focus on regional issues such as arms control and regional security, water, the environment, the fate of the Palestinian refugees and the displaced, and the economic balance among the peoples of the area through joint development programmes."

Dr. Abu Jaber said any settlement must be based on United Nations decisions, especially Security Council Resolution 242, which calls for Israel's withdrawal from territory it occupied from Jordan, Syria and Egypt in 1967.

He reminded Mr. Shamir that his state emerged from U.N. General Assembly Resolution 181 in 1947, which carved out a state for the Jews in what was Palestine under the British Mandate, urging him to accept international legitimacy on the Palestinian question.

Dr. Abu Jaber noted that "our cause and that of our Palestinian brethren is intricately linked," an allusion to Jordan's control over the West Bank before its seizure by Israel in 1967.

He insisted that a settlement must also involve Israeli withdrawal from the Syrian Golan Heights, and from a border strip in South Lebanon.

"Arab sovereignty must be restored in Arab Jerusalem," Dr. Abu Jaber stressed.

for Palestinians — the first time they had been permitted to express their views at a peace conference.

"Our homeland has never ceased to exist in our minds and hearts, but it has to exist as a state on all the territories occupied by Israel in the war of 1967, with Jerusalem as its capital," Dr. Abdul Shafiq declared.

Calling the Israeli occupation of territories taken in 1967 illegal, Dr. Abdul Shafiq lambasted Israeli "cruelty" and praised the Palestinian uprising that has raged in the territories for nearly four years.

He said the Palestinians had an inalienable right to self-determination.

"As we speak, the eyes of thousands of Palestinian refugees, deportees and displaced persons since 1967, are haunting us, for exile is a cruel fate: set them free..."

The settlements must stop now. Peace cannot be waged while ... the status of the occupied territories is being decided each day by Israeli bulldozers and barbed wire."

Confidence-building measures like these would prove Israel was willing to negotiate in good faith, he added.

It was an emotional occasion

By Dr. Naser Tabboub

SINCE THE 1967 war, the Jordanian leadership has exerted relentless effort to implement United Nations resolutions 242 and 338, and establish a just and lasting peace between the Arabs and Israel.

United Nations Resolution 242 calls for the withdrawal of Israeli occupying forces from the territories occupied in 1967

war, the termination of the state of belligerency and the respect and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area.

3). The resolution of the problem of Palestinian refugees in accordance with United Nations resolutions.

4). The resolution of the

Palestine question in all its

aspects.

5). And on this basis, peace

negotiations will be conducted under the auspices of an international conference.

The hallmark of the agree-

ment was "compromise and

accommodation with the reali-

ties of the 1980s."

For Jordan, international, regional and domestic constraints provided no alternative but to engage in a joint role with the PLO on a

framework for peace. Mean-

while, the moderate platform

of the 17th session of the Pales-

tine National Council in 1984

demonstrated Chairman Ara-

fat's acknowledgement of com-

promise as a political means of

securing the return of the West

Bank and Gaza Strip in accord-

ance with the formula "territory

for peace."

International conditions pre-

vented a "go it alone" posture

by either the PLO or Jordan, and imposed the necessity for compromise.

The intention of the agree-

ment was to reach a just and

durable peace could imme-

diately result in catastrophic

outcomes on the domestic, re-

gional and international levels

for decades to come.

6). Presidents Bush and Gor-

bachev's support is essential

and particularly significant.

Why? Because it is for the

first time since the end of the

World War II that the superpo-

wers have made a commitment to

end conflict and violence in

the region and offer hope to the

future generations of the area

to live in peace.

Presidents Bush and Gorbachev's support is essential and particularly significant. Why? Because it is for the first time since the end of the World War II that the superpo-

wers have made a commitment to

end conflict and violence in

the region and offer hope to the

future generations of the area

to live in peace.

Presidents Bush and Gorbachev's support is essential and particularly significant. Why? Because it is for the first time since the end of the World War II that the superpo-

wers have made a commitment to

end conflict and violence in

the region and offer hope to the

future generations of the area

to live in peace.

Presidents Bush and Gorbachev's support is essential and particularly significant. Why? Because it is for the first time since the end of the World War II that the superpo-

wers have made a commitment to

end conflict and violence in

the region and offer hope to the

future generations of the area

to live in peace.

Presidents Bush and Gorbachev's support is essential and particularly significant. Why? Because it is for the first time since the end of the World War II that the superpo-

wers have made a commitment to

end conflict and violence in

the region and offer hope to the

future generations of the area

to live in peace.

Presidents Bush and Gorbachev's support is essential and particularly significant. Why

Jordanians react angrily to Shamir's speech, praise Abu Jaber's address

By Serene Halasa and Nidal M. Ibrahim
Special to the Jordan Times

AMMAN — Jordanians — from the common man to government officials to university professors — reacted with disappointment, sadness, disillusionment and anger at the speech given Thursday by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir at the Madrid peace conference.

At the same time, Jordanian Foreign Minister Kamel Abu Jaber's speech was praised as being pragmatic and accurate of Jordan's position on the peace process and related issues.

Mr. Shamir, who is leading the Israeli delegation to the historic Middle East peace talks in the Spanish capital, reflected the same hardline view that has been emanating from Tel Aviv for the past few years, officials and analysts said.

"The speech was awful," said a former minister who requested anonymity. "Shamir did not move an inch and he seemed to insist on having all the land."

"He did not give any sign that they (the Israelis) are ready for the land for peace formula," he told the Jordan Times.

Mr. Shamir's speech, made at the Royal Palace in Madrid, was based with historical and biblical references to the continuity and rights of the Israeli people to "the Land of Israel."

"He was directing his speech to the Torn mentality, placing a religious backdrop to disguise international legitimacy," said Tamer Hikmat, a former minister and prominent lawyer. "He did not even show signals of compromise."

Mr. Shamir's speech was "evasive" and "emotional," seeking to counter attacks on Israel's claim to the land it occupied in the 1967 Middle East war, said Dr. Hazem Nuseibeh, former Jordanian ambassador to the United

Nations.

"In his speech, Shamir ignored important issues such as international legitimacy, the rights of Palestinians on their own land, conciliation based on land for peace and the release of hundreds of thousands of political prisoners held in prisons in the occupied territories," he said.

While agreeing that the cornerstones of the peace conference were to be U.N. Security Council resolutions 242 and 338, Mr. Shamir nonetheless ignored the essence of those documents in his speech, said Dr. Naser Tabibou, a political science professor at the University of Jordan.

Shamir presented a summary of Zionist history and linked it to the Arab-Israeli conflict, failing to acknowledge U.N. resolutions 242 and 338, he said.

Instead of talking about reconciliation based on international legitimacy and compromise, Mr. Shamir reflected a siege mentality, said Dr. Sari Nasir, a sociology professor at the University of Jordan.

Shamir did not have much to offer, but seemed to tell the Arabs that Israel is insecure and needs proof that they will not threaten it," he said. "But Shamir forgot that Arabs, especially Palestinians, need more security from Israel. Especially as they slowly watch their lands being swallowed by illegal immigrants."

The meaning and failings of Mr. Shamir's speech was also reflected in comments from common Jordanians. The tone and content of Mr. Shamir's speech did not reflect that of a man willing to make the necessary concessions to achieve peace, they said.

"He wants peace on his own terms," said Salwa Bamihi, 39. "He calls for peace but didn't take any steps that would encourage other people to talk to him."

A halt to the building of

ce professor.

The Jordanian speech, in an apparent reference to unilateral Israeli acts which contravene internationally acceptable behaviour such as bombing raids in Lebanon, reflected the Jewish state's aggressive mentality, said Dr. Nasir.

Dr. Abu Jaber "presented the case in an acceptable manner, emphasising the Arab position in general and the Jordanian one in particular," Mr. Hikmat said.

The weakness in the Jordanian presentation, however, lay in that it did not allude specifically to 1948 and the loss of Arab land, said one official who requested anonymity. In repeating an off-made mistake, the speech did not address the loss of life, land, and materials resulting from the conflict previous to 1967.

Also, the speech was not presented in a forceful manner and was haphazard at times, the official said.

Still, the speech received praise from Jordanians in that it again communicated to the world Jordan's willingness to find a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Dr. Abu Jaber's speech "shows that Jordan is going for peace," Ms. Bamihi said. At the same time, she added, it was clear that the Kingdom was seeking a "fair peace. We don't want a peace at any price."

Mr. Hikmat said he was disappointed by Dr. Abu Jaber's speech in that it did not answer Mr. Shamir's references to the spilling of Jewish blood.

"I don't think it was as strong as Shamir's," he said. "I was expecting Abu Jaber's speech to be as strong."

Mr. Shamir's speech, full of descriptive references which created an image of suffering and bloodshed perpetrated on the Jewish people, should have been countered with reference to the plight of the Palestinians, he said.

Drawing heavily from His Majesty King Hussein's speech to the National Congress on Oct. 12 and on the principle of land for peace, Dr. Abu Jaber called on Israel to abandon the "mental straitjacket" that has prevented it from recognising the national rights of the Palestinians and to seek accommodation and reconciliation with the Arabs.

"Dr. Abu Jaber used logic and common sense in reflecting the Jordanian position that calls for real and comprehensive peace," said Dr. Tabibou, the political scientist.

A halt to the building of

the co-sponsors of the peace conference in maintaining Israel's hegemony over Palestinian territory through continued political and military support.

"Israel was created through an agreement with Britain. It was sustained by the U.S. and then further strengthened by the Soviet Union's decision to allow the Soviet Jewish influx into Palestine," Mr. Bakr said. Other analysts, while accepting this criticism, stressed the international value of Dr. Abdul Shafiq's speech and the need for it to remain acceptable to the co-sponsors, especially since it clearly antagonised the Israeli delegation by its clear reference to the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) and Palestinians in the diaspora.

Throughout Dr. Abdul Shafiq's speech it was clear that the PLO is the party that authorised him to be there and that he represented all Palestinians, including Jerusalemites and those in the diaspora. It was done in a very subtle way," an analyst said. "It was extremely good."

Other analysts also noted that the deliberate concessions offered by the Palestinian delegate could also be clearly designed to preempt any Israeli argument over his reference to the PLO.

"On the one hand, the delegate said that the Palestinian delegation was authorised by the PLO," noted one analyst. "On the other hand, he also implied that the delegation was more or less willing to accept the same starting point, which, by all indications, is also acceptable to the Israelis as the starting point."

"It effectively pulls out the rug from under the Israeli feet," he said.

In general, analysts said, Dr. Abdul Shafiq pulled together all the elements that the Palestinian and Jordanian viewers needed to see emanating from the Palestinian delegation at the Madrid conference.

Tamer Hikmat

not mention that "Palestine was occupied twice — once in 1948 and another in 1967."

On the other hand, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, Mr. Hikmat pointed out, "gave a very stiff speech that started at the climax of his demands, therefore allowing himself a large room for concessions."

Although the Arabs were expected to portray a moderate stance to add momentum to the historical Madrid conference, which has brought Arabs and Israelis to the negotiating table, Mr. Hikmat said he would have liked to see a "more hardened strategy on the borders issue."

"It seems that adopting the mid-point strategy from the onset of negotiations would mean making concessions to below that mid-point while starting slightly higher may have allowed a margin of concessions towards that mid-point," Mr. Hikmat said.

Mr. Bakr described as a "major mistake" the acceptance of 1967 borders at the beginning of negotiations. Even in the context of international legitimacy, he said, the armistice lines drawn after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war "were never final."

Mr. Bakr also criticised the Arab speeches, including that of Dr. Abdul Shafiq, for failing to address the role played by

"He was very firm on the Arab and Palestinian foundations and stressed the status of Jerusalem, yet he was also able to address a segment of the Israelis and lay out exactly what the outcome of the negotiations should be," one political analyst said.

"The elements were all there: Withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories, the establishment of a separate Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital and halting settlements immediately," the analyst pointed out.

Other analysts added that Dr. Abdul Shafiq's speech and his announcement that Palestinians will accept an interim arrangement for the occupied Arab territories also served to complete the circle that was started by Foreign Minister Kamel Abu Jaber's speech earlier Thursday.

"Dr. Abu Jaber wrapped the international legality argument and the Arab insistence on a peaceful solution based on international law but left the issues that concern the Palestinians for them to complete," one analyst said.

"Dr. Abdul Shafiq was left to accept what only the Palestinians can say they would: the interim arrangement for the occupied territories," the analyst added.

Although voices of dissent were heard among the analysts over whether Dr. Abdul Shafiq was within "his terms of reference" when he announced Palestinian acceptance over the interim period, most analysts agreed that the Palestinian delegate's announcement, coupled with his statements on a separate Palestinian state and a possible confederation with Jordan, "provided practical solutions to the Palestinian problem."

"What we had after we heard the two speeches from the Jordanian and Palestinian sides is the complete framework for the Jordanian-Palestinian argument," he added.

Mr. Bakr also criticised the Arab speeches, including that of Dr. Abdul Shafiq, for failing to address the role played by

King meets European Parliament chief Crespo believes most Israelis ready for compromise

AMMAN (J.T.) — His Majesty King Hussein received Thursday European Parliament President Enrique Baron Crespo and an accompanying delegation which arrived in Amman late Wednesday on a three-day visit.

Discussions during the meeting centred on the Middle East peace conference, which opened in Madrid Wednesday, and ways to bring it to a successful end with emphasis on Europe's role in supporting the peace process, the Jordan News Agency, Petra, said.

The meeting also discussed Euro-Jordanian relations and ways of promoting and bolstering them.

King Hussein expressed satisfaction of the level of these relations.

Mr. Crespo expressed Europe's support for Jordan and voiced pride in King Hussein and his stands which support peace endeavours.

The meeting was attended by His Royal Highness Crown Prince Hassan, Prime Minister Taher Masri, Royal Court Chief Sharif Zeid Ben Shaker, Senator Ahmad Obeidat, the King's Political Advisor Adnan Abu Odeh and the King's Military Secretary His Royal Highness Prince Talal Ben Mohammad.

Mr. Crespo will hold a press conference at Queen Alia International Airport before his departure Friday in which he will talk about the outcome of his visit to Jordan.

Mr. Crespo, who arrived in Jordan from Israel, said earlier he believed most Israelis were ready for a compromise to settle the 43-year-old Middle East conflict with the Arabs.

"My advise to all the parties (in the Madrid talks) is to have a lot of patience and to be ready to go forward," he said before going for talks with King Hussein.

While in the Jewish state,

His Majesty King Hussein and His Royal Highness Crown Prince Hassan Thursday met with Euro-

pean Parliament President Enrique Baron Crespo (Petra photo)

and is necessary."

Mr. Crespo ruled out suggestions that the European Community would exert pressure on Israel if it refused to soften its hardline stand at the talks.

"... I think that the best thing to be done is to let the people go ahead and express their will," he said.

"Now we are in a moment of hope and are not of talking of pressure. Peace can only come through the positions of the people that must make up their mind to share the future of this region peacefully."

His Majesty King Hussein and His Royal Highness Crown Prince Hassan Thursday met with Euro-

pean Parliament President Enrique Baron Crespo (Petra photo)

Abdul Shafiq sets the tone for negotiating position

By Lami K. Andoni
Jordan Times Staff Reporter

THE IMPLICITY, albeit unequivocally, pledging allegiance to the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) and reiterating commitment to Palestinian national rights, head of the Palestinian negotiating team Haider Abdul Shafiq Thursday challenged but did not break the ground rules of the Madrid Middle East peace conference.

In his 45-minute address to the opening session, Dr. Abdul Shafiq indicated that despite the physical absence of the PLO — in accordance with American and Israeli terms — the organisation remained the democratically chosen leader of the Palestinians inside the Israeli-occupied territories and in the diaspora.

He also firmly reiterated full-fledged commitment in complete harmony with the PLO institutions resolutions to the goal of establishing an independent Palestinian state with East Jerusalem as its capital — a goal which Israel vehemently resists and the U.S. refuses to support.

The Palestinian speech, in the view of political observers, was expected to set the tone for the Arab negotiating position — since the Palestinian problem is regarded by all Arabs as the crux of the Arab-Israeli conflict — and to positively influence public opinion in support of Arab participation at the peace conference.

Dr. Abdul Shafiq was cautious not to raise hopes or expectations but to prepare the Arab people for a long process and possibly the Palestinian delegation to refer to the conference "a new stage in the struggle for the liberation."

Dr. Abdul Shafiq's speech, which bears strong prints of the leading Palestinian poet Mahmoud Darwish's philosophical touch, revealed the main outlines of the Palestinian negotiating strategy.

The main element of the Palestinian negotiating position, as contained in Dr. Abdul Shafiq's speech, was that the Palestinians have not abandoned any of their national demands despite their failure of securing American support for these goals prior to the conference.

To begin with, Dr. Abdul Shafiq was firm in reiterating that negotiations will be meaningless if there was no immediate halt to the Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories.

The leader of the Palestinian delegation refrained,

however, from making any threats or even implying that the team will withdraw if the objective was not attained.

A possible scenario is that the Palestinians will simply

will not budge on their position and will refuse to move to other issues unless the settlement problem is addressed.

The Palestinians, again as implied in Dr. Abdul Shafiq's speech, are seeking to develop the already set agenda to meet the minimum Palestinian national demands.

That was particularly clear when Dr. Abdul Shafiq presented the Palestinian interpretation of the transitional period — which is supposed to involve Palestinian self-rule or autonomy for the Palestinians.

The key words revealing Palestinian thinking came when Dr. Abdul Shafiq emphasised that the transitional period should not be allowed to be transformed into a "permanent" situation.

This statement reflected one of the major Palestinian concerns that the autonomy will turn into some form of legitimisation of "a subde" legitimate Israeli occupation. To prevent such a possibility, according to the points made in Dr. Abdul Shafiq's speech, the Palestinian delegation will demand the implementation of the fourth Geneva Convention to provide international protection of the Palestinian people and to ensure that the Palestinians will assert control over their lives.

But a main challenge for the Palestinian delegation is how to succeed in directing the negotiations, specifically how to shape the interim period in a way that can lead to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state — a goal that the Palestinian delegation will demand the Palestinians message has not changed — the Palestinians are giving peace a chance but the other forms of struggle will continue if diplomacy failed.

Dr. Abdul Shafiq's speech indicated that the Palestinians will simply

Shamir

(Continued from page 1)

nians will first focus on an interim three-year period of self-rule.

"But nothing can be achieved without good will. I appeal to the Arab leaders, those who are here and those who have not yet joined the process: Show us and the world that you accept Israel's existence."

"Had Israel's policies not been settler-colonialist, Palestinians languishing under Israeli occupation since 1948 been humane, millions of Arabs, Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese would not have been uprooted from their homes nor would they have been denied until today their right to return."

"Demonstrate your readiness to accept Israel as a permanent entity in the region. Let the people in our region hear you speak in the language of reconciliation, coexistence and peace with Israel," Mr. Shamir said.

"In Israel there is an almost total consensus for the need for peace. We only differ on the best ways to achieve it," he said.

"We would like to see in your countries an end to poisonous preachers against Israel. We

would like to see like to see an indication of the kind of hunger for peace which characterises Israeli society."

Arab delegation sat impassively through his highly-charged, sometimes combative speech in the hall of columns inside Madrid's Royal Palace.

"Today, the Gulf separating the two sides is still too wide, the Arab hostility to Israel too deep — the lack of trust too immense to permit a dramatic, quick solution."

"But," Mr. Shamir continued, "we must start on the long road to reconciliation with this first step in the peace process."

Mr. Shamir made no mention in his 30-minute speech of the 100,000 Jewish settlers in the occupied territories.

The settlements have been condemned by the United States as an obstacle to peace and Arab delegations have appealed to Israel to halt their construction.

responded with inhumane treatment of Palestinians.

"Had Israel's political orientation since 1948 been humane, millions of Arabs, Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese would not have been uprooted from their homes nor would they have been denied until today their right to return."

"Had Israel's policies not been settler-colonialist, Palestinians languishing under Israeli occupation since 1948 been humane, millions of Arabs, Palestinians, Syrians and Lebanese would not have been uprooted from their homes nor would they have been denied until today their right to return."

"Demonstrate your readiness to accept Israel as a permanent entity in the region. Let the people in our region hear you speak in the language of reconciliation, coexistence and peace with Israel," Mr. Shamir said.

"In Israel there is an almost total consensus for the need for peace. We only differ on the best ways to achieve it," he said.

"We would like to see in your countries an end to poisonous preachers against Israel. We</p

Jordan Times

An independent Arab political daily published in English by the Jordan Press Foundation

Established 1975

الجريدة العربية الوحيدة التي تنشر المقالات والآراء

Chairman of the Board of Directors:

MAHMOUD AL KAYED

Director General:

MOHAMMAD AMAD

Editor-in-Chief:

GEORGE S. HAWATMEH

Editorial and advertising offices:

Jordan Press Foundation,

University Road, P.O. Box 6710, Amman, Jordan.

Telephones: 667171/6, 670141-4

Telex: 21497 ALRAJ JO

Faximile: 661242

The Jordan Times is published daily except Fridays. Subscription and advertising rates are available from the Jordan Times advertising department.

Palestinian stones and Shamir's fossilised history

THE PALESTINIAN children of the intifada, instead of throwing stones at Israeli troops, were Thursday handing them olive branches. That most certainly was not a Palestinian reaction to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir's call on them to end the intifada. It is an Arab expression of the yearning for peace and compromise in Palestine.

Shamir on Thursday, in Madrid, leapt on the podium to deliver Israel's address to the Middle East peace conference. Instead of talking about the mechanism for peace and his vision for reconciliation, the Israeli prime minister lectured his audience on his version of the history of Palestine and the Jewish people. Not only did he misinterpret history, but almost blamed everybody, including the Palestinians whom the Israeli army is repressing, for the plight of the Jews throughout the ages. The fact that the whole world was waiting in eagerness to hear Shamir offer some hope for peace did not deter him from revelling in the bitterness he acquired as a persecuted Jew in pre-World War II Poland. That bitterness seems to have obscured his vision of the real objective of the Madrid gathering.

While Dr. Kamel Abu Jaber, the foreign minister, talked about Jordan's vision of the future and of peace, Shamir chose to talk about the past, twisting the fact that Jews lived all over the Middle East in peace and harmony until the creation of the Jewish state. "Although the world, and the Israeli themselves, know and are aware of our innocence of the crimes against the Jewish people, Israel's indignant outrage has not induced a sense of balanced justice," Dr. Abu Jaber said. Abu Jaber reminded his Israeli counterparts that Jews and Arabs were the children of Abraham, the founder of the three great monotheistic religions. Shamir, meanwhile, admitted that 800,000 Jews inhabited the Arab World "before the rise of Islam" and only left after the creation of Israel. In contrast to Shamir's loaded address, which failed to touch on the plight of the Palestinians, the head of the Palestinian delegation, Dr. Haider Abdul Shafi expressed Palestinian sympathy with Jewish suffering and their safety as occupiers of Palestine and oppressors of Palestinians.

Shamir repeatedly called on the Arabs to make peace, but he failed to say how and on what bases he was prepared to make peace. In his rhetoric, the Israeli prime minister also sought to dehumanise the Palestinians by accusing them of being terrorists and of exposing their children to danger by sending them to throw bombs and stones at (Israeli) soldiers and civilians.

What clearly emerges from the Israeli prime minister's address is an unwillingness to accept that as his people nurtured a 2,000-year-old yearning for Palestine, Palestinians who were forced to leave the Holy Land in 1948 and 1967 have also a strong longing for that country. What Shamir fails to understand at this crucial moment, this last chance, is that the Palestinian claim for Palestine is as strong, if not stronger, than that of the Jews. And unless the two people shared the land and shared Jerusalem as well, there will never be peace in Palestine. If Palestinian and Israeli hopes for peace are squandered by those who, like Shamir, thrive on twisted tales of history instead of dreaming of a better future and mutual coexistence, the children who distributed olive branches Thursday will go back to throwing stones.

ARABIC PRESS COMMENTARIES

THE FOUR speeches delivered at the opening session of the Madrid peace conference dwelt on the need for the implementation of U.N. Security Council resolutions 242 and 338 and stressed the importance of respecting legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, said Al Ra'i's Arabic daily Thursday. The paper said that these principles reflected President Bush's own initiative of last March, further stressing the fact that the peace conference convened in Madrid was a real effort towards achieving these goals. The European Community's address to the conference laid stress on the need for the implementation of the international legitimacy and U.N. Security Council resolutions, said the paper. The European Community emphasised that the Europeans are full partners and can be called upon in the process to help the two sides reach a lasting settlement, the paper added. Egypt's address was more explicit with regard to the Palestine question. Foreign Minister Amer Mousa, who delivered the address, stressed the need for full Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab lands, including Jerusalem which Israel annexed after the 1967 war. The paper said that the opening session reflected an international consensus on the need for Israel to comply with the will of the world community and implement U.N. resolutions which entail the exchange of land for peace so that a lasting peace can be achieved. The paper expressed satisfaction with the addresses of the speakers on the first day of the conference and voiced hope that the two sides will reach a just settlement that would bring an end to the sufferings of the peoples in the Middle East region.

A columnist in Al Ra'i's daily Thursday expressed disappointment with presidents of the Soviet Union and the United States who failed to live up to the aspirations of millions of Arabs when they avoided openly to side with justice. Tareq Masarweh said that the American president has said that the world community can not impose peace on the region, but the Arab masses realise that it is in the power of the world community in general and the superpowers in particular to force Israel to leave the land it has occupied for a quarter of a century in defiance of U.N. Security Council resolutions and world legality. In referring to the Soviet leader's speech, Masarweh said that Mr. Gorbachev had referred to the right of the Palestinians in their homeland, but his country's actions speak otherwise. He said that by dispatching hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews to occupied Palestine Moscow is helping the Israelis to evict more Palestinians, depriving the oppressed people of Palestine of any rights. Both presidents, he stressed, should have demanded our outright freeze to Jewish settlement programmes as a condition to start the direct negotiations, the writer said. He said that the Arabs should be careful and vigilant.

The following editorial appeared in the Oct. 26 issue of the Economist.

live with the Jewish state. Resignation versus reconciliation

BY making it almost impossible for Israel or the Arabs to stay away from the conference in Madrid, James Baker, the American secretary of state, has done what nobody else has done before. He has persuaded the Arabs and the Israelis to sit together and talk peace. Consider, for a moment, how bizarre this is. The first big war between Israel and the Arabs happened in 1948. The fact that it has taken 43 years and half-a-dozen wars to start comprehensive talks (Egypt alone came to Camp David) is a grotesque indictment of the way human beings organize their affairs. The fact that they have now agreed to talk requires an explanation.

Part of the explanation is that the United States, thinking freshly after the end of the cold war, has lost patience with the Likud Party's dream of a greater Israel and resolved to force it into compromise. Part has to do with the subtlety of Mr. Baker, who has spent months since the Gulf war methodically depriving all the parties of their usual excuses for being intransigent. But the main explanation has to do with something invented back in the 1920s. Its inventor called it the iron wall.

Most of the early Zionists paid little attention to the Arabs of Palestine. They thought or hoped, or pretended to think and hope, that the Arabs would accept and maybe even welcome the creation of a Jewish state. One right-wing Zionist, Vladimir Jabotinsky, saw that this was nonsense. He said that the Arabs would oppose the swamping of Palestine with Jewish immigrants and that "if we were Arabs, we would not accept it either." His conclusion was that Zionism could prosper only behind an "iron wall" of military power.

A lot of people, when they hear Israel recite its security mantra, stifle a yawn. Why should this regular winner of wars, bomber of Arabs, stager of audacious

raids, ally of America and possessor of atomic bombs be afraid of anything? The yawners need to imagine the 40 years of cold war in Europe compressed into the area of Wales. On each side of the Arab-Israeli conflict are vast armies, with thousands of tanks and hundreds of modern aircraft—and worse horrors, such as chemicals and missiles, in reserve. If Israel went back to its pre-1967 lines, as the Arab claim Security Council Resolution 242 requires it to, the border would slice through the middle of Jerusalem and curl within nine miles of Tel Aviv. Nine miles is a lap and a half of Manhattan's Central Park. No country—let alone one with memories like Israel's—would be calm about that.

A peace that leaves Israel's anxiety unanswered is only too likely to lapse into the old pattern of fear and war. The dismal precedent is 1957, the year after Suez, when President Eisenhower forced the Israelis out of the Sinai peninsula but failed to get President Nasser to accept Israel's legitimacy. That simply brought the Israelis thundering back in again the next time they were threatened.

If 1957 shows the need to pay attention to Israel's fears, the Israel-Egyptian peace of 1979 show the worthlessness of an agreement that neglects the Palestinians. In Palestinian minds Camp David has become a symbol of betrayal. President Sadat made his peace with Israel, and the world applauded, but all he won for the residents of the West Bank and Gaza was a promise of self-government, which Israel anyway ignored. If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

A lot of people, when they hear Israel recite its security mantra, stifle a yawn. Why should this regular winner of wars, bomber of Arabs, stager of audacious

raids, ally of America and possessor of atomic bombs be afraid of anything? The yawners need to imagine the 40 years of cold war in Europe compressed into the area of Wales. On each side of the Arab-Israeli conflict are vast armies, with thousands of tanks and hundreds of modern aircraft—and worse horrors, such as chemicals and missiles, in reserve. If Israel went back to its pre-1967 lines, as the Arab claim Security Council Resolution 242 requires it to, the border would slice through the middle of Jerusalem and curl within nine miles of Tel Aviv. Nine miles is a lap and a half of Manhattan's Central Park. No country—let alone one with memories like Israel's—would be calm about that.

A peace that leaves Israel's anxiety unanswered is only too likely to lapse into the old pattern of fear and war. The dismal precedent is 1957, the year after Suez, when President Eisenhower forced the Israelis out of the Sinai peninsula but failed to get President Nasser to accept Israel's legitimacy. That simply brought the Israelis thundering back in again the next time they were threatened.

If 1957 shows the need to pay attention to Israel's fears, the Israel-Egyptian peace of 1979 show the worthlessness of an agreement that neglects the Palestinians. In Palestinian minds Camp David has become a symbol of betrayal. President Sadat made his peace with Israel, and the world applauded, but all he won for the residents of the West Bank and Gaza was a promise of self-government, which Israel anyway ignored. If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

A lot of people, when they hear Israel recite its security mantra, stifle a yawn. Why should this regular winner of wars, bomber of Arabs, stager of audacious

A land to share

raids, ally of America and possessor of atomic bombs be afraid of anything? The yawners need to imagine the 40 years of cold war in Europe compressed into the area of Wales. On each side of the Arab-Israeli conflict are vast armies, with thousands of tanks and hundreds of modern aircraft—and worse horrors, such as chemicals and missiles, in reserve. If Israel went back to its pre-1967 lines, as the Arab claim Security Council Resolution 242 requires it to, the border would slice through the middle of Jerusalem and curl within nine miles of Tel Aviv. Nine miles is a lap and a half of Manhattan's Central Park. No country—let alone one with memories like Israel's—would be calm about that.

A peace that leaves Israel's anxiety unanswered is only too likely to lapse into the old pattern of fear and war. The dismal precedent is 1957, the year after Suez, when President Eisenhower forced the Israelis out of the Sinai peninsula but failed to get President Nasser to accept Israel's legitimacy. That simply brought the Israelis thundering back in again the next time they were threatened.

If 1957 shows the need to pay attention to Israel's fears, the Israel-Egyptian peace of 1979 show the worthlessness of an agreement that neglects the Palestinians. In Palestinian minds Camp David has become a symbol of betrayal. President Sadat made his peace with Israel, and the world applauded, but all he won for the residents of the West Bank and Gaza was a promise of self-government, which Israel anyway ignored. If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so.

If peace is possible, it has to be looked for somewhere in between the Arab demand for justice and the Israeli demand for security.

All of this ancient stuff still matters. History will press like a stone on the conference in Madrid. It has imprinted on the Arab side a conviction, impossible to erase, that the very existence of Israel is an injustice. On the Israeli side is a conviction, equally ineluctable, that if the Arabs could find a way to sit Israel's throat they would joyfully do so

'Geography cannot guarantee security and security does not come from military might alone'

Jordan is not Palestine

Following is the full text of Foreign Minister Kamel Abu Jaber's speech at the Madrid conference as made available to the Jordan Times by Jordan Media Group:

It is with sincere appreciation that I thank the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for co-sponsoring this historic conference. For us this occasion represents what we must strive to make the final turning point, from a drift towards ultimate disaster for our peoples, our region and possibly the world to a new era of a properly constructed true peace, hope and life. All the parties to this most chronic and tragic conflict need your continued interest and support, together with the rest of the world, so that we may attain the just peace that the peoples of the region need and deserve.

We also salute His Majesty King Juan Carlos, the guardian of Spanish democracy, as well as Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez, the Spanish Government and people for hosting the conference in Madrid. We thank them for their gracious hospitality and warm welcome.

This is an historic moment. The challenges and the issues before us are momentous. In his speech before the National Conference in Amman on 12th October, 1991, His Majesty King Hussein identified the essence of the challenge when he spoke of the possibilities of true peace and its implications for the future of the children of Abraham, Jews and Arabs alike. It is worthy of note that Spain seeks to honour Arabs and Jews in 1992 in the context of the contributions of the Andalus and Sephard. Together they generously contributed to a rich civilisation, the fruits of which not only Spain but the world and humanity have since appreciated.

It is not impossible to hope that this conference will herald the dawn of a new era to rectify the mistakes of the past. Perhaps the possibility of joint contribution is again at hand. Everyone must remember that God has created mankind and made them nations and tribes so that they may know each other. The most honoured in the sight of Allah is the most pious (The Holy Koran, Sura 49/13). And if this conference does anything it must end Israel's self-righteous attitude to live by its own rules alone. This conference is also about the credibility of international law, the United Nations Charter and human rights.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Jordan comes to this conference in good faith. Our vision is not merely an end to hostility — another truce — but a comprehensive, just and permanent peace. Our region has known nothing but instability and violence since the turn of the century. It is about time that it enjoys peace.

What is needed is not only sight but vision-vision to stand on top of the hill, not in the valley, so as to enable ourselves to look into the future and to evaluate the consequences of the absence of peace. For far too long the peoples of the region have been locked in the groove of their own historical animosities, suspicions and acrimony.

That is why we in Jordan register our appreciation for the endeavour of President Bush as well as the support of President Gorbachev. It is our hope that the personal interest and support of both will remain, even increase, throughout the negotiations.

We come to this conference standing on strong moral grounds, buttressed by a record of moderation and wise vision since the creation of our state in modern times. The most tragic conflict which we are now addressing is one of the oldest on the agenda of the United Nations and though it may appear regional, its international dimensions are many and obvious. It is especially so against the background of the Gulf crisis in that it severely tests the credibility of the United Nations and that of the five permanent members of the Security Council. It was in the wake of the Gulf crisis that President Bush undertook to work seriously toward its resolution. We also appreciate the Soviet co-sponsorship of the effort as well as the support of the European Community. We take heart that this whole enterprise is firmly anchored in international legitimacy as embodied in United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 providing for the exchange of land for peace.

While it was true that most Arabs, out of a sense of outrage and feelings of injustice and betrayal, have refused since 1947 to contemplate accommodation, there were others in the Arab World who were willing to be counted for peace. Over the decades of the thirties, forties and beyond, indeed until the present moment, the arena was abandoned to the radicals.

In the clash of ideas, visions and armies that have ensued since then, reason, often humanity itself, was pushed beyond the frontiers of choice. The situation deteriorated to the condition of a primitive state of nature, where brute force replaced civilised behaviour, where might replaced right. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, which I have the honour to represent, has been since the outset of this conflict, on the side of every effort to seriously solve it peacefully. King Hussein was actively involved in the formulation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, a founder of this conference.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Today we have an historic opportunity for peace in a land that has not tasted it for a long time, we must remember that the extremists and the rejectionists who speak in absolute terms are still lurking in the wings. It is from there that they issue their often repeated clichés and venomous threats.

In as much as peace is a good in itself, as an inherent value, it is also a battle against the absolutist ideologies invoking ancient hatreds. Many think that the situation should not be resolved but left to future generations to deal with. Those of vision, however, see it differently. Considering the immediacy of the need to reach a settlement at this particular moment of world history with its interdependence between people and nations, King Hussein said:

"... We must be involved in the drive for peace because it concerns our present and future... otherwise, the outcome, God forbid will be ominous dangers..."

It is for this reason that it is important to emphasise transcending the present in the search for the future. To continue to be locked in the mental strait-jacket of absolutist ideologies means that there will never be a way out of the shackles of hatred.

We take to heart and with respect the words of President Bush in his 6th of March, 1991 address before the American Congress, when he said:

"... I expressed my hope that out of the horrors of war might come new momentum for peace. We have learned in the modern age, geography cannot guarantee security and security does not come from military power alone.... By now, it should be plain to all that peace-making in the Middle East requires compromise..."

Peace cannot, indeed must not, reflect the military balance of the belligerents now. It should, essentially, reflect the hope of a better future that will end, once and for all, our living in the midst of conflicting tragedies. It should bring us all in step with a new world that will shatter the shadow, the misery and the fog that engulfs our lives. It was albert Einstein who said "... Peace cannot be kept by force. It can only be achieved by understanding..." It should not be a peace at any price but an honourable peace with which we and future generations can live: a durable peace which is the product of negotiations. It must be the outcome of mutual understanding and accommodation between the parties to the conflict without sacrificing rights or deviating from the principles of international law.

Jordan's position rests on the very simple yet direct assumption that in the end nothing is true but the truth; that a moral and just stand is ultimately more powerful than brute force. Although the world, and the Israelis themselves, know and are aware of our innocence of the crimes against the Jewish people, Israel's indignant outrage has not induced a sense of balanced justice. It has become our fate in Jordan to live with as well as to suffer and to contain the powerful forces of extremism. The Nazis and others unleashed the passions of injured Zionism for which the Palestinians and Jordan have paid the price.

God only knows the price we continue to pay for the sins of others. It has come to pass that our land, our culture, our people, even our very souls, as well as everything we hold dear and sacred, continue to be plundered and distorted to accommodate new realities and manufactured facts, brutally created on the ground.

And so it is that we not only ask what to do, but also welcome the present effort. The question is the more agonising as we in the Arab World, and in Jordan in particular, contemplate our situation. In Jordan three times in four decades, we had to make room for large waves of destitute and bewildered refugees forced out of their lands and homes.

We are aware, as are our people, that in the nature of things a negotiated settlement does represent total justice. Yet, with our traditional Jordanian moderation, rational approach, and consideration of our vision of the future, we have made consensus and balance a cornerstone of our political thesis since 1967. In the words of King Hussein:

"... Peace is essential to us in leading a normal life... we have made it a symbol for a better life for future generations... peace has become a national objective..."

That is why we think that the formula of land for peace brings more meaningfully true than any other principle or slogan. The echo of the drums of war reverberates in the heart and soul of the region. Is it not time that we, now on the threshold of the twenty first century, bring peace to our peoples?

Ladies and gentlemen,

Jordan enters this process from a position of moral strength, secure in the knowledge that reasonable men can reach reasonable solutions; that justice must ultimately prevail; that peace is indeed the master of all judgements, and its logic necessitates accommodation not belligerency. Otherwise, we may truly become one dimensional with neither soul nor spirit, driven by the primeval instincts of the political jungle, leading us to perish in perils of our own making.

We should shed the psychology of fear, get out of the shadow and realise that states too, like people, sometimes commit suicide because of their fear of life. More land is not more security. Occupation is against every legal principle and the shape it has taken in the Arab occupied territories contravenes the United Nations Charter and the Fourth Geneva Convention. The building of settlements and the expropriation of land are both in clear contravention of the rules of international law.

The justice that Jordan seeks requires resort to law; that law governs the actions of men and freeing them to live secure in a stable, ordered and institutionalised universe. That alone can assure the proper division of labour and resources and that alone can guarantee not only survival, but freedom and security. The technology of war has far out-distanced our true appreciation of its destructiveness and danger. Otherwise, how can we continue to contemplate our security in terms of missiles, nuclear, biological and chemical weapons? Our mission must transcend the issues of mere survival to become the search for a new future.

That is why His Majesty King Hussein, in his nation-wide speech of 12th October, 1991 solicited the help and support of the International Community in this process:

"Our cause is not only between us and Israel but also between the world and Israel... between the supremacy of international law... and the flouting of it... The whole world rejects what Israel's leadership is saying because it contravenes international legitimacy... Indeed, a relatively growing segment of Israelis are not too far from this world view..."

The King added, that our world today is "peace-oriented" and that the Arabs and the rest of the world will come together in their mutual desire and interests to find a peaceful solution.

That is one of the bases of the Jordanian position: a search for peace secure in the support of the entire Arab World, indeed the whole world community and in particular the Palestinians. We and the Palestinians have a just cause which must be addressed and resolved with equity and fairness.

Our second basis for entering this peace process is our expectation that there will be no asymmetry or double standards.

The third basis of the Jordanian approach is that our cause and that of our Palestinian brethren is intricately linked by ties of history, culture, religion, language, demography, geography, as well as human suffering and national aspirations. King Hussein has said that we would have preferred an independent Palestinian delegation though we have no objection to providing an umbrella for our Palestinian brethren, since we are keenly aware that both Jordanians and Palestinians are besieged as the parties directly and adversely affected by the continuation of the status quo of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Fourth, the peace we seek must be based on United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 and 338. The objective real peace. We must emphasise that our understanding of Resolution 242 is that it is based on the principle of land for peace. The deliberations preceding its adoption and in which Jordan participated were based on that principle. Our position is firmly based on United Nations resolutions and international law. We are aware that Israel's creation was the result of United Nations Resolution 181 of 29th November, 1947. It is in accordance with the strength of these resolutions as well as the general principles of international law that Jordan demands the total withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied Jordanian, Palestinian, Syrian and Lebanese Lands.

The three dimensions of the Jordanian position — the

Jordanian, Palestinian and regional — are founded on international law. Resolution 242 is a valid international instrument unanimously agreed upon by the International Community. It is binding on all member states of the United Nations in accordance with Article 25 of the United Nations Charter. Arab sovereignty must be restored in Arab Jerusalem. In the context of peace, Jerusalem will represent the essence and symbol of peace between the followers of the three great monotheistic religions. It is God's will that has made the historic city important to them all.

The illegal settlements should be removed and not augmented; the issue of Palestinian refugees and that of the displaced must be solved in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions. The Palestinian people must be allowed to exercise their right of self-determination in their ancestral homeland. The fulfillment of these demands is a question of the credibility of United Nations resolutions. Let me speak plainly — Jordan has never been Palestine and is not so now.

Withdrawal from Lebanon and the application of United Nations Security Council Resolution 425 is also an essential prerequisite for the establishment of a regional peace.

Fifth, the peace we seek as a result of negotiations is a permanent one, a just and comprehensive peace — peace that will focus on region-wide issues such as arms control and regional security, settlements, water, the environment, the fate of the Palestinian refugees and the displaced, and the economic balance among the peoples of the area through joint development programmes. Peace must mean security for all, protected by all in their hearts and souls because it is founded on justice and honour.

Sixth, our position is also predicated on our vision of a better future that will replace the present bitterness and frustration and, in the words of King Hussein:

"...Enable us to transform these realities into positive forces that will take us from despair to hope, from confrontation and the four decades of suffering, anxiety and pain that accompanied it, and which left an imprint on our lives, to peace and its promise of security, stability, opportunities and prosperity for all; from the no-war no-peace situation and its real dangers, to a condition of certainty and ease which will enhance the creativity and hopes of the younger generation..."

We seek a real peace where men, women and children do not have to cower behind fortresses. Our quest is for an honourable peace that would enable our peoples to tear down the walls of fear and hatreds, as people tore down the Berlin Wall. We want our peoples to welcome a new dawn and to enjoy the warmth of a new day, rather than the long night of darkness, which has been their fortune until now.

Ladies and gentlemen,

It is our hope, that the world appreciates and supports our position based as it is on our liberal and peaceful Jordanian experiment in socio-economic and political development. An experiment that deserves support as it continues the Jordanian tradition of democratisation, institutionalisation and the transition to political pluralism. The test, indeed the challenge of peace, is both domestic and global in that it severely exacerbates our current economic crisis, as we are compelled to absorb a third wave of refugees in the wake of the Gulf crisis.

We hope that this peace conference will work toward the solution of all these momentous problems leading not only to the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Arab occupied lands including Arab Jerusalem, but also to the delineation of Israel's permanent borders and finally real peace.

We have taken a bold step which commits us to innovative thinking that will bring peace and prosperity to the region. The parties to the conflict suffer from too many recollections of their wounded cultures. Somehow we must endeavour to bring about the change needed. We cannot continue to inhabit two different universes in this small space of land with its limited resources. Already there is too much ideological rigidity that continues to be an obstacle to sensible and rational life. For those who continue to think in absolute terms we must emphasise that while history may have time, men are mortal; that not only our civilisations need their wounds to be healed, but the very land scarred by the march of armies to the drums of war, needs mending as well. There exists a limit to force and this may be the moment to heal not only the mental agony but also to remove the physical trenches dug deep in the land. This requires patience, perseverance and wisdom deeper than mere intelligence.

Ladies and gentlemen,

It is fitting to end this statement with a verse from the Holy Koran.

"Let not a people's enmity towards you incite you to act contrary to justice; Be always just, that is closest to righteousness." (The Holy Koran, Sura 5-8).

Shamir calls on Arabs to make peace, but fails to say how

Address by Yitzhak Shamir, prime minister of Israel, at the peace conference in Madrid, Oct. 31, 1991:

Distinguished Co-Chairmen, Ministers, Members of Delegations to the Conference, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an honour to represent the people of Israel at this historic moment; and a privilege to address this opening of peace talks between Israel and its Arab neighbours.

I would like to express our profound appreciation to our Spanish hosts for their hospitality, and for making this gathering for peace possible. In its two thousand years of wandering, the Jewish people have here for several hundred years, until they were expelled 500 years ago. It was in Spain that the great Jewish poet and philosopher, Yehuda Halevi, expressed the yearning for Zion of all Jews, in the words:

"My heart is in the East,
while I am in the uttermost West."

I would also like to extend our appreciation to the co-sponsors of this conference — to the U.S., which has maintained a strong friendship with Israel in an alliance that has overcome occasional differences. And to the Soviet Union, which saved the lives of many Jews during the Second World War, and has now opened its gates to the repatriation of Jews to their ancient homeland.

The people of Israel look to this palace with great anticipation and expectation. We pray that this meeting will mark the beginning of a new chapter in the history of the Middle East; that it will signal the end of hostility, violence, terror and war; that it will bring dialogue, accommodation, coexistence and — above all — peace.

Distinguished Co-Chairmen, Ladies and Gentlemen;

To appreciate the meaning of peace for the people of Israel, one has to view today's Jewish sovereignty in the land of Israel against the background of our history.

Jews have been persecuted throughout the ages in almost every continent. Some countries barely tolerated us; others oppressed, tortured, slaughtered and exiled us.

This century saw the Nazi regime set out to exterminate us. The Shoah, the Holocaust, the catastrophic genocide of unprecedented proportions which destroyed a third of our people, became possible because no one defended us. Being homeless, we were also defenceless.

But it was not the Holocaust which made the world community recognise our rightful claim to the Land of Israel. In fact, the

rebirth of the state of Israel so soon after the Holocaust has made the world forget that our claim is immemorial. We are the only people who have lived in the land of Israel without interruption for nearly 4000 years; we are the only people, except for a short crusader kingdom, who have had an independent sovereignty in this land; we are the only people for whom Jerusalem has been a capital; we are the only people whose sacred places are only in the Land of Israel.

No nation has expressed its bond with its land with as much intensity and consistency as we have. For millennia our people repeated at every occasion the cry of the psalmist: "If I forget thee, Jerusalem, may my right hand lose its cunning." For millennia we have encouraged each other with the greeting, "next year in Jerusalem." For millennia our prayers, literature and folkloric have expressed powerful longing to return to our land. Only Eretz-Israel, the Land of Israel, is our true homeland. Any other country, no matter how hospitable, is still a diaspora, a temporary station on the way home.

To others, it was not an attractive land. No one wanted it. Mark Twain described it only a hundred years ago as "a desolate country, which sits in sackcloth and ashes, a silent mournful expanse, which not even imagination can grace with the pomp of life."

The Zionist movement gave political expression to our claim to the Land of Israel. And in 1922, the League of Nations recognised the justice of this claim. If understood the compelling historic imperative of establishing a Jewish homeland in the Land of Israel. The United Nations Organisation reaffirmed this recognition after the Second World War.

Regrettably, the Arab leaders, whose friendship we wanted, most, opposed a Jewish state in the region. With a few distinguished exceptions, they claimed that the Land of Israel is part of the Arab domain that stretches from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf.

In defiance of international will and legality, the Arab regimes attempted to overrun and destroy the Jewish state even before it was born. The Arab spokesman at the U.N. declared that the establishment of a Jewish state would cause a bloodbath which would make the slaughters of Genghis Khan pale into insignificance.

In its Declaration of Independence on May 15, 1948 stretched out its hand in peace to its Arab neighbours, calling for an end to

war and bloodshed. In response, seven Arab states invaded Israel. The U.N. resolution that partitioned the country was thus violated and effectively annulled.

The U.N. did not create Israel. The Jewish state came into being because the tiny Jewish community, in what was Mandatory Palestine, rebelled against foreign imperialist rule. We did not conquer a foreign land. We repelled the Arab onslaught, prevented Israel's annihilation, declared its independence and established a viable state and government institutions within a very short time.

After their attack on Israel failed, the Arab regimes continued their fight against Israel with boycott, blockade, terrorism and outright war. Soon after the establishment of Israel, they turned against the Jewish communities in Arab countries. A wave of oppression, expropriation and expulsion caused a mass exodus of some 800,000 Jews from lands they had inhabited from before the rise of the Islam.

Most of these Jewish refugees, stripped of their considerable possessions, came to Israel. They were welcomed by the Jewish state. They were given shelter and support, and they were integrated into Israeli society together with half a million survivors of the European Holocaust.

The Arab regimes' rejection of Israel's existence in the Middle

East and the continuous war they have waged against it, are part of history. There have been attempts to rewrite this history, which depict the Arabs as victims and Israel as the aggressor. Like attempts to deny the Holocaust, they will fail. With the demise of totalitarian regimes in most of the world, this perversion of history will disappear.

In their war against Israel's existence, the Arab governments took advantage of the cold war. They enlisted the military, economic and political support of the Communist world against

Palestinians speak with pain and pride

Following is the address of the Palestinian delegation to the Madrid Middle East peace conference, presented by Dr. Haider Abdul Shafi, head of the delegation.

Secretary Baker, Foreign Minister Pankin,

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, On behalf of the Palestinian delegation, I would like to extend our warmest gratitude to our host, the government of Spain, for its gracious hospitality, and to King Carlos and Prime Minister Gonzales. We thank the co-sponsors of the Middle East peace conference for their relentless efforts in convening this conference. A special thanks is due from our delegation to the United Nations and to the nations of Europe and Scandinavia, for their consistent and principled support for the rights of the Palestinian people.

Ladies and gentlemen,

We meet in Madrid, a city with the rich texture of history, to weave together the fabric in which joins our past with the future, to reaffirm a wholeness of vision, which once brought about a rebirth of civilisation and a world order based on harmony in diversity.

Once again, Christian, Muslim and Jew face the challenge of heralding a new era enshrined in global values of democracy, human rights, freedom, justice and security. From Madrid we launch this quest for peace, a quest to place the sanctity of human life at the centre of our world and to redirect our energies and resources from the pursuit of mutual destruction to the pursuit of joint prosperity, progress and happiness.

We, the people of Palestine, stand before you in fullness of our pain, our pride, and our anticipation, for we have long harboured a yearning for peace and a dream of justice and freedom. For too long the Palestinian people have gone unheeded, silenced and denied — our identity negated by political expediency, our rightful struggle against injustice maligned, and our present existence subsumed by the past tragedy of another people.

Your excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, for the greater part of this century, we have been victimised by the myth of "a land without a people," and deserved with impunity as "the invisible Palestinians." Before such wilful blindness, we refused to disappear or to accept a distorted identity. Our intifada is a testimony to our perseverance and resilience, waged in a just struggle to regain our rights.

It is time for us to narrate our own story, to stand witness as advocates of a truth which has long been buried in the somnolence and conscience of the world. We do not stand before you as supplicants, but rather as the torch bearers who know that in our world of today, ignorance can never be an excuse. We seek neither an admission of guilt after the fact, nor vengeance for past inequities, but rather an act of will that will make a just peace a reality. We speak out, ladies and gentlemen, from the full conviction of the rightness of our cause, the verity of our history, and the depth of our commitment. Therein lies the strength of the Palestinian people today, for we have scaled the walls of fear and resilience and we wish to speak out with the courage and integrity that our narrative and history deserve.

The co-sponsors have invited us here today to present our case to reach out to "the other" with whom we have had to face a mutually exclusive reality on the land of Palestine. But even in the invitation to this peace conference, our narrative was distorted and our truth only partially acknowledged. The Palestinian people are one, rused by centuries of history in Palestine, bound together by a collective memory of shared sorrows and joys and sharing a unity of purpose and vision. Our songs and ballads, our folk tales and children's stories, the dialect of our jokes, the images of our poems, that hint of melancholy which colours even our happiest moments, are as important to us as the blood ties which link our families and clans.

Yet an invitation to discuss peace, the peace we all desire and need, comes to only a portion of our people. It ignores our national, historical, and organic unity. We come here wracked from our sisters and brothers in exile to stand before you as the Palestinians under occupation, although we maintain that each of us represents the rights and interest of the whole. We have been denied the right to publicly acknowledge our loyalty to our leadership and system of government, but allegiance and loyalty cannot be censored or severed. Our acknowledged leadership is more than just the democratically chosen leadership of all the Palestinian people; it is the symbol of our national identity and unity — the guardian of our past, the protector of our present, and the hope of our future. Our people have chosen to entrust it with their history and the preservation of our precious legacy. This leadership has been clearly and unequivocally recognised by the community of nations, with only a few exceptions who had chosen, for so many years, shadow over substance.

Regardless of the nature and conditions of our oppression, whether the dispossession and dispersion of calls on the brutality and repression of the occupation, the Palestinian people cannot be torn asunder. They remain united, a nation wherever they are, or are forced to be. And Jerusalem, ladies and gentlemen, that city which is not only the soul of Palestine but the cradle of three world religions, is tangible even in its claimed absence from our midst at the stage. Its apparent, though artificial, exclusion from this conference is a

denial of its right to seek peace and redemption, for it too has suffered from war and occupation. Jerusalem, the city of peace, has been barred from a peace conference and deprived of its calling. Palestinian Jerusalem, the capital of our homeland and future state, defines Palestinian existence — past, present and future — but itself has been denied a voice and an identity. Israel's annexation of Jerusalem remains both clearly illegal in the eyes of the world community and an affront to the peace that this city deserves.

We come to you from a tortured and a proud, though captive, people, having been asked to negotiate with our occupiers, but leaving behind the children of the intifada, and a people under occupation and under curfew, who enjoined us not to surrender or forget. As we speak, thousands of our brothers and sisters are languishing in Israeli prisons and detention camps, most detained without evidence, charge or trial, many cruelly mistreated and tortured in interrogation, guilty only of seeking freedom or daring to defy the occupation. We speak in their name and we say: Set them free.

As we speak, the tens of thousands who have been wounded or permanently disabled are in pain: Let peace heal their wounds. As we speak, the eyes of thousands of Palestinian refugees, deportees, and displaced persons since 1967, are haunting us, for exile is a cruel fate: bring them home. They have the right to return. As we speak, the silence demolished homes echoes through the halls and in our minds: we must rebuild our homes in our free state.

And what do we tell the loved ones of those killed by army bullets? How do we answer the questions and the fear in our children's eyes? For one out of three Palestinian children under occupation has been killed, injured or detained in the past four years. How can we explain to our children that they are denied education, our schools so often closed by army fiat? Or why their life is in danger for raising a flag in a land where even children are killed or jailed? What rights can be sung for trees uprooted by army bulldozers? And, most of all, who can explain to those lands are confiscated and clear waters stolen, the message of peace? Remove the barbed wire, restore the land, and its life-giving water.

The settlements must stop now. Peace cannot be waged while Palestinian land is confiscated in myriad ways and the status of the occupied territories is being decided each day by Israeli bulldozers and barbed wire. This is not simply a position; it is an irreducible reality. Territory for peace is a travesty when territory for illegal settlement is official Israeli policy and practice. The settlements must stop now.

In the name of the Palestinian people, we wish to directly address the Israeli people with whom we have had a prolonged exchange of pain: let us share hope instead. We are willing to live side by side on the land and the promise of the future. Sharing however, requires two partners willing to share as equals. Mutuality and reciprocity must replace domination and hostility for genuine reconciliation and coexistence under international law. Your security and ours are mutually dependent, as entwined as the fears and nightmares of our children.

We have seen some of your best and at your worst, for the occupier can hide no secrets from the occupied, and we are witness to the toll that occupation has exacted from you and yours. We have seen you anguish over the transformation of your sons and daughters into instruments of a blind and violent occupation — and we are sure that at no time did you envisage such a role for the children whom you thought would forge your future. We have seen you look back in deepest sorrow at the tragedy of your past and look on in horror at the disfigurement of the victim turned oppressor. Not for this have you nurtured your hopes, dreams and your offspring.

This is why we have responded with solemn appreciation to those of you who came to offer consolation to our bereaved, to give support to those whose homes were being demolished, and to extend encouragement and counsel to those detained behind barbed wire and iron bars. And we have marched together, often choking together at the non-discriminatory tear gas or crying out in pain as the clubs descended on both Palestinian and Israeli alike. For pain knows no national boundaries, and no one can claim a monopoly on suffering.

We once formed a human chain around Jerusalem, joining hands and calling for peace. Let us today form a moral chain around Madrid and continue that noble effort for peace and the promise of freedom for our sons and daughters. Break through the barriers of mistrust and manipulated fears. Let us look forward in magnanimity and in hope.

To our Arab brothers and sisters, most of whom are represented here in this historic occasion, we express our loyalty and gratitude for their life-long support and solidarity. We are here together seeking a just and lasting peace whose cornerstone is freedom for Palestine, justice for the Palestinians, and an end to the occupation of all Palestinian and Arab lands. Only then can we really enjoy the fruits of peace: Prosperity, security and human dignity and freedom.

In particular, we address our Jordanian colleagues in our joint delegation. Our two peoples have a very special historic and

geographic relationship. Together, we shall strive to achieve peace. We will continue to strive for our sovereignty, while proceeding freely and willingly to prepare the grounds for a confederation between the two states of Palestine and Jordan, which can be a cornerstone for our security and prosperity.

To the community of nations on our fragile planet, to the nations of Africa and Asia, to the Muslim world, and particularly to Europe, on whose southern and neighbouring shores we meet today: from the heart of our collective struggle for peace, we greet you and acknowledge your support and recognition. You have recognised our rights and our government and have given us real support and protection. You have penetrated the distorting mist of racism, stereotyping and ignorance and committed the art of seeing the "invisible" and listening to the voice of the silenced. The Palestinians, under occupation and in exile, have become a reality in your eyes and, with courage and determination, you have affirmed the truth of our narrative. You have taken up our cause and our case, and we have brought you into our hearts. We thank you for caring and daring to know the truth — the truth which must set us all free.

To the co-sponsors and participants in this occasion of awe and challenge, we pledge our commitment to the principle of justice, peace and reconciliation based on international legitimacy and uniform standards. We shall persist in our quest for peace, to place before you the substance and determination of our people, often victimised but never defeated. We shall pursue our people's right to self-determination, to the exaltation of freedom, and to the warmth of the sun as a nation among equals.

This is the moment of truth: You must have the courage to recognise it and the will to implement it for our truth can no longer be hidden away in the dark recesses of inadvertency or neglect. The people of Palestine look at you with a straightforward, direct gaze, seeking to touch your heart, for you have dared to stir up hopes that cannot be abandoned. You cannot afford to let us down, for we have lived up to the values you espouse, and we have remained true to our cause.

We, the Palestinian people, made the imaginative leap in the Palestine National Council of November 1988, during which the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) launched its peace initiative based on Security Council resolutions 242 and 338 and declared Palestinian independence based on Resolution 181 of the United Nations, which gave birth to two states in 1948: Israel and Palestine. In December 1988, a historic speech before the United Nations in Geneva led directly to the launching of the Palestinian-American dialogue. Ever since then, our people have responded positively to every serious peace initiative and has done its utmost to ensure the success of this process. Israel, on the other hand, has placed many obstacles and barriers in the path of peace to negate the very validity of the process. Its illegal and frenzied settlement activity is the most glaring evidence of its rejectionism, the latest settlement being erected just two days ago.

These historic decisions of the Palestine National Council wrench the course of history from inevitable confrontation and conflict towards peace and mutual recognition. With our own hands, and in an act of sheer will, we have moulded the shape of the future of our people. Our parliament has articulated the message of a people with the courage to say "yes" to the challenge of history, just as it provided the reference, in its resolutions last month in Algiers and in the Central Council meeting this month in Tunis, to go forward to this historic conference. We cannot be made to bear the brunt of other people's "no." We must have reciprocity. We must have peace.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the Middle East there is no superfluous people outside time and place, but rather a state sorely missed by time and place — the state of Palestine. It must be born on "the land of Palestine to redeem the injustice of the destruction of its historical reality and to free the people of Palestine from the shackles of their victimisation. Our homeland has never ceased to exist in our minds and hearts, but it has to exist as a state on all the territories occupied by Israel in the war of 1967, with Jerusalem as its capital, in the context of that city's special status and its non exclusive character.

This state, in a condition of emergence, has already been a subject of anticipation for too long. It should take place today, rather than tomorrow. However, we are willing to accept the proposal for a transitional stage, provided interim arrangements are not transformed into permanent status. The time frame must be condensed to respond to the dispossessed Palestinians' urgent need for sanctuary and to the occupied Palestinians' urgent need for recognition of their authentic will. During this phase, international protection for our people is most urgently needed, and the *de jure* application of the Fourth Geneva Convention is necessary condition. The phases must not prejudice the outcome; rather they require an internal momentum and motivation to lead sequentially to sovereignty. Bilateral negotiations on the withdrawal of Israeli forces, the dissolution of Israeli administration and the transfer of authority to the Palestinian people cannot proceed under coercion or threat in the current asymmetry of power. Israel must demonstrate its willingness to negotiate in good faith by immediately halting all settlement activity and land confiscation while implementing meaningful confidence-building measures. Without genuine prog-

ress, tangible constructive changes and just agreements during the bilateral talks, multilateral negotiations will be meaningless. Regional stability, security and development are the logical outcome of an equitable and just solution to the Palestinian question which remains the key to the resolution of wider conflicts and concerns.

In its confrontation of wills between the legitimacy of the people and the illegality of the occupation, the intifada's message has been consistent: to embody the Palestinian state and to build its institutions and infrastructure. We seek recognition for this creative impulse which nurtures within it the potential nascent state. We have paid a heavy price for daring to substantiate our authenticity and to practice popular democracy in spite of the cruelty of occupation. It was a sheer act of will that brought us here, the will which asserted itself in the essence of the intifada, as the cry for freedom, an act of civil resistance, and people's participation and empowerment. The intifada is our drive towards nation building and social transformation. We are here today with the support of our people, who have given itself the right to hope and to make a stand for peace. We must recognise, as well, that some of our people harbour serious doubts and skepticism about this process. Within our democratic, social and political structures. We have evolved in respect for pluralism and diversity, and we shall guard the opposition's right to differ within the parameters of mutual respect and national unity.

The process launched here must lead us to the light at the end of the tunnel, and this light is the promise of a new Palestine — free, democratic, and respectful of human rights and the integrity of nature.

Self-determination, ladies and gentlemen, can neither be granted nor withheld at the whim of the political self-interest of other, for it is enshrined in all international charters and humanitarian law. We claim this right; we firmly assert it here before you and in the eyes of the rest of the world, for it is a sacred and inviolable right which we shall relentlessly pursue and defend with dedication and self-confidence and pride.

Let us end the Palestinian-Israeli fatal proximity in this unnatural condition of occupation, which has already claimed too many lives. No dream of expansion or glory can justify the taking of a single life. Set us free to reengage as neighbours and as equals on our holy land.

To our people in exile and under occupation, who have sent us to this appointment laden with their trust, love and aspirations, we say that the load is heavy, and the task is great, but we shall be true. In the words of our great national poet, Mahmoud Darwish: "My homeland is not a suitcase, and I am no traveller." To the exiled and the occupied, we say: You shall return and you shall remain and we will prevail for our cause is just. We will put on our embroidered robes and kufiyas and, in the sight of the world, and celebrate together on the day of liberation.

Refugee camps are no fit home for people who had been reared on the land of Palestine, in the warmth of the sun and freedom. The hail of Israeli bombs, almost daily pouring down on our defenceless civilian population in the refugee camps of Lebanon, is no substitute for the healing rains of the homeland. Yet, the international will had ensured their return in United Nations Resolution 194 — a fact wilfully ignored and unacknowledged.

Similarly, all other resolutions pertinent to the Palestinian question, beginning with Resolution 181, through Resolutions 242 and 338, and ending with Security Council Resolution 681, have, until now, been relegated to the domain of public debate, rather than real implementation. They form the larger body of legality, including all relevant provisions of international law, within which any peaceful settlement must proceed. If international legitimacy and the rule of law are to prevail and govern relations among nations, they must be respected and, impartially and uniformly, implemented. We, as Palestinians, require nothing less than justice.

To Palestinians everywhere today we bear in our hands the precious gift of your love and your pain, and we shall set it down gently here before the eyes of the world and say — there is a right here which must be acknowledged, the right to self-determination and statehood; there is strength and there the smell of burnt incense in the air Jerusalem, the collective human, cultural and spiritual memory and an aggression against its enduring symbols of tolerance, magnanimity, and respect for cultural and religious authenticity. The cobbled streets of the Old City must not echo with the discordant beat of Israeli military boots, we must restore to them the chant of the muezzin, the chimes of the church bells, and the prayers of all the faithful calling for peace in the City of Peace.

From Madrid, let us light the candle of peace and let the olive branch blossom. Let us celebrate the rituals of justice and rejoice in the hymns of truth, for the awe of the moment is a promise to the future, which we all must redeem. The Palestinians will be free, and will stand tall among the community of nations in the fullness of the pride and dignity which by right belongs to all people. Today, our people under occupation are holding high the olive branch of peace. In the words of Chairman Arafat in 1974 before the U.N. General Assembly: "Let not the olive branch of peace fall from the hands of Palestinian people."

Arabs see Shamir speech as negative

(Continued from page 5)

Reuters

Jaber said he was cautiously optimistic about the results.

The spokesman for the Jordanian delegation to the conference, Dr. Marwan Musher, told the press that Mr. Shamir's speech was very negative in nature and represented a distorted image of the historic facts.

"The aim of the peace conference is to talk about the future and the implementation of U.N. resolutions and not to talk about the past," Dr. Musher said.

"We were very disappointed," said Dr. Musher.

Palestinian delegate Saeb Erekat said Mr. Shamir's speech came as no surprise.

Faisal Husseini, chairman of an advisory group accompanying the Palestinian team, said "we hope that this stance will not be the permanent stance."

Palestinian delegate Saeb Erekat said Mr. Shamir's speech came as no surprise.

Dr. Erekat, an activist whom Mr. Shamir tried to exclude from the Palestinian delegation, said:

"The man thinks of this gathering as only a public relations exercise to show the world that Israel wants peace."

"But when it comes to it, you can see it in his face, he is not here because he desires peace but because he could not say no to the Americans."

Mr. Aghazarian said: "I would have liked to hear him admit that Palestinians in the occupied territories are suffering. It's not just a question of shaking hands or the same old entrenched positions."

"He brought to this conference the tone and attitude of the occupier," he said, accusing Mr. Shamir of "racism and distortion."

"He did not make a single conciliatory gesture to the Palestinians," he said.

"On the contrary, he told us what we had to do."

"My first impression about Shamir's speech is that it contains a lot of faking of facts and defaming history," Syrian Foreign Minister Farouq Al Sharaa told

Shamir calls on Arabs to make peace, but fails to say how

(Continued from page 5)

bringing peace. We have agreed to precede such talks with this ceremonial conference, but we hope that Arab consent to direct, bilateral talks indicates an understanding that there is no other way to peace. In the Middle East, this has special meaning, because such talks imply mutual acceptance; and the root cause of the conflict is the Arab refusal to recognise the legitimacy of the State of Israel.

The multilateral talks that would accompany the bilateral negotiations are a vital component in the process. In these talks, the essential ingredients of coexistence and regional cooperation will be discussed. There cannot be genuine peace in our region unless these regional issues are addressed and resolved.

We believe the goal of the bilateral negotiations is to sign peace treaties between Israel and its neighbours, and to reach an agreement on interim self-government arrangements with the Palestinian Arabs.

But nothing can be achieved without good will. I appeal to the Arab leaders, those who are here and those who have not yet joined the process: Show us and the world that you accept Israel's existence. Demonstrate your readiness to accept Israel as a permanent entity in the region. Let the people in our region hear you speak in the language of reconciliation, coexistence and peace with Israel.

In Israel there is an almost total consensus for the need for peace. We only differ on the best ways to achieve it. In most Arab countries the opposite seems to be true: the only differences are over the ways to push Israel into a defenceless position and, ultimately, to destruction. We would like to see in your countries an end to poisonous preachings against Israel. We would like to see an indication of the kind of hunger for peace which characterises Israeli society.

We appeal to you to renounce the Jihad against Israel. We appeal to you to denounce the PLO covenant which calls for Israel's destruction. We appeal to you to condemn declarations that call for Israel's annihilation, like the one issued by the revisionist conference in Tehran last week. We appeal to you to let Jews, who wish to leave your countries, go.

And we address a call to the Palestinian Arabs: Renounce violence and terrorism; use the universities in the administered territories — whose existence was made possible only by Israel — for learning and development, not agitation and violence; stop exposing your children to danger by sending them to throw bombs and stones at soldiers and civilians.

Just two days ago, we were reminded that Palestinian terrorism is still rampant, when a mother of seven children and a father of four were slaughtered in cold blood. We cannot remain indifferent and be expected to talk with people involved in such

ravage this image by shedding blood.

I am sure that there is no Arab mother who wants her son to die in battle — just as there is

Madrid Conference

Passions beneath erupt at Jordanian briefing in Madrid

By Dalia Baligh
The Associated Press

MADRID — The passions repressed at the formal opening of the Middle East conference spilled over in a free-wheeling dialogue Wednesday between Israeli and American journalists and Jordan's foreign minister.

"I wish to welcome you and to receive answers from you — excuse me, to receive questions from you, and hopefully also some answers," said Foreign Minister Kamel Abu Jaber, setting the tone for what diplomats would call a frank and friendly exchange.

Dr. Abu Jaber, a white-haired 59-year-old political scientist, gave a performance that contrasted sharply with the icy atmosphere in the conference chamber.

He spoke off-the-cuff and from the heart, gesturing, smacking his fist into his palm. Many of the questions came from Israeli reporters, and the give-and-take was much more emotional than a normal news conference is supposed to be.

A radio reporter, telling

Dr. Abu Jaber he was live on the air in the Jewish state, asked whether he was prepared to come to Israel to negotiate.

The location did not matter, Dr. Abu Jaber said.

"We are talking about issues that have been in the hearts of men and in the minds of men. We are talking about rigid ideologies. We are talking about hatred. We are talking about struggle that has lasted for at least 100 years, six or seven wars, a lot of atrocities.

"So the idea of whether we go here or there, I think it is a matter of procedure, it is not a substantive matter."

When another reporter asked whether Jordan wanted real peace, based on mutual security and direct negotiations, Dr. Abu became indignant.

"We want security, but I mean everybody forgets that we in Jordan and we in Syria, the Palestinian people are screaming for security.

"Now let us look at the balance of power in the Middle East, gentlemen — ladies and gentlemen — I mean, who should ask for security?



Kamel Abu Jaber

We are the ones who are asking for it. We do not have 300 atomic or nuclear weapons. You know the recent book by Mr. Seymour Hersh, *Samson's Choice*. We demand security because we are afraid too.

Mr. Hersh, the Pulitzer prize-winning investigative reporter, says in the book that Israel has atomic weapons and considered using them in the 1973 Middle East war. Israel has never confirmed or denied having

the bomb. On the question of shaking hands with prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, Dr. Abu Jaber showed good-humored exasperation.

"Everybody is so obsessed with the idea of shaking hands. I mean, you know, there are millions of people in the world I don't shake hands with," he said, drawing a laugh.

Indeed, he added, he might one day clasp Mr. Shamir's hand: "When things fall in place, when we reach settlement, when our rights are recognised, when the Palestinian people are recognised and their self-determination, when Jerusalem — Arab Jerusalem — is returned to Arab sovereignty..."

A reporter from the Jerusalem Post asked whether President George Bush's call for "territorial compromise" applied to Arabs as well as Israelis.

"Whose land is occupied, sir?" The foreign minister said. "Syrian lands are occupied, the Golan Heights. Lebanese lands are occupied, Palestinian lands are occupied, and indeed Jordanian

land. So I mean what are we supposed to compromise, more land?"

Dr. Abu Jaber said he hoped to achieve a settlement "that I can live with, that when I look in the mirror I am not ashamed of myself."

"That when my daughter asks me, or my grandchild asks me, I can tell to him, look, I took the risks, I put my heart on my hand to take peace. I took the risk for peace, because it does take courage to make peace. But we can't do it alone, the other side must reciprocate."

At the end, a reporter said: "We're not saying that you have to kiss Mr. Shamir, but you even made a Freudian slip and said maybe you'll take an answer from the press. Why don't you start with that small step and shake his hand tomorrow?"

But Dr. Abu Jaber returned to the point, saying with a laugh: "I mean, why should I kiss him for God's sake?"

"Would you shake his hand?"

Dr. Abu Jaber left the question hanging and left the podium.

Syrian papers see U.S., Soviet speeches supportive of Arabs

DAMASCUS (Agencies) — Syria's state-controlled newspapers on Thursday interpreted the opening statements at the Middle East peace conference in Madrid as supportive of Arab views.

On the second day of the conference many people tuned to foreign radio and television stations as on the first day to hear or see live broadcasts of the speeches.

The opening address by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir was being simultaneously translated into Arabic by some radios. This sparked immediate reactions and guffaws from listeners to some of Mr. Shamir's statements.

"What about you?" was a popular reaction by many Syrians to an appeal by Mr. Shamir to the Arab World to recognise and accept the existence of Israel in the region.

"Why don't you accept and recognise the 'Palestinians' as equals," reacted one Palestinian refugee, Adnan Ondsi, as other people listening to the live broadcast nodded.

"The ball is now in the Israeli court and the Israelis should not swim against the international tide," commented the daily *Tishrin*.

Two other papers, *Al Thawra* and *Al Baath*, used banner headlines to quote statements by the U.S. and Soviet presidents and the European Community (EC) representative at the conference.

Al Thawra's main headline said: "Hopes raised on first day of conference."

A secondary headline said: "No peace without Israeli withdrawal and halt to settlements."

Al Baath's headline quoted President George Bush as saying "we work for a just and permanent settlement and negotiations on the basis of 242 and 338."

Al Baath also headlined the call by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev for "respect for the rights of the Palestinian people."

Commenting editorially *Tishrin* said: "It has become clear from the opening of the conference that to pulling back from the path of peace would leave the region at daggers drawn. Going back on the peace process is unthinkable."

Al Baath noted that "Israel is still holding on to its intransigent stands, refusing to halt settlement activity and adhering to the con-

tinuing occupation of Arab land."

"Will Israel continue its rejectionist stand, or succumb to the international will?" the paper asked.

In Madrid, Syria's foreign minister said that Israel is making an issue of the site for face-to-face talks with its Arab neighbours in an effort to derail the peace process.

Farouk Al Sharra insisted the bilateral talks be held in Madrid after the initial three-day meeting and said moving the negotiations to the Middle East could inflame passions.

"My feeling is that when the Israelis raise such an issue they have in mind to undermine the peace process that would follow the peace conference," he said in an interview with the U.S. Cable News Network.

"Even if we moved into another place, they would create another problem of another nature. Our impression is that the Israelis are not coming here to make peace."

Al Sharra said all the parties at the peace conference had agreed on Madrid as the site for the peace conference "and we have to continue here."

The Israelis say they want to hold the bilateral negotiations in the Middle East, but Mr. Sharra said that could be dangerous.

"That would raise emotions which might not be helpful to achieve results," he said.

Some Syrian delegates privately expressed disappointment with President Bush's opening speech, which did not mention their demand for return of the Golan Heights.

Mr. Sharra, however, viewed the speech more positively.

"I think he spoke about the Syrian Golan, and in his speech it is not necessary that he speaks about details," Mr. Sharra said.

He said the United States had provided Syria with assurances that a settlement of the Israeli-Arab conflict would be based on the return of Arab lands taken in 1967.

"And I don't think, or even imagine, that President Bush would back away from these commitments, whether he mentioned them in the speech or not," Mr. Sharra said.

Madrid answers first question: 'Who are the Palestinians?'

By Daoud Kuitab
Special to the Jordan Times

MADRID — IT was a special day for me by all means: Whether it was the large kefifya that adorned Saeb Erekat's shoulders as he sat in the front row of the opening session defying the Israelis who wanted to exclude him because he dared state the obvious — that the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) is the group that had chosen the Palestinian delegation; or if it was that special Palestinian national spirit that let Hanan Mikhail Ashrawi wear the beautifully embroidered suit jacket at her first official press conference defying in it what another woman had said nearly 20 years ago. She had challenged Golda Meir's now almost forgotten statement when she asked "Who are the Palestinians?"

For me however, the clothes that Dr. Erekat and Dr. Ashrawi were wearing was not as important as the content of what was happening; that Palestine was represented by its people who had come with an open mind to discuss for the first time in more than 40 years their own destiny by themselves.

That momentous political and symbolic moment at the opening was still not the highlight. For me the highlight was the second session to which Palestinian journalists were invited as part of the pool system. This pool system was not part of a general pool. The Palestinian delegation was given a number of cards permitting their journalists to enter the palace and record the moments of history being made. To some of us our mere presence at that place was as much history as the conference itself. We took pictures of ourselves at

the empty conference room before other delegates entered. It was almost not important what pictures or stories we were too excited with being there to think of things such as reporting.

The excitement of Palestinian journalists were not any less than the excitement of the delegates. I took special concern to take the photos and try to talk to Sameh Kanaan, the Palestinian fighter who had been imprisoned more than half the years of his life. He sat there with the full excitement of a fighter that had reached a long awaited goal. At the end of the first session he came towards me and asked if I could take his picture. I said OK.

He responded by asking me a strange question. "Make sure that (Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak) Shamir is in the same picture?" At the time Shamir had turned his back talking to an Israeli delegate.

Maybe that was just fine with Kanaan. What he wanted was that his presence in the same room as Mr. Shamir be recorded. When I asked him his feelings he gave me the answer to the strange request. I am happy to be here. I am in this room meeting face to face with the prime minister of the government that has oppressed me and my people for many years.

The excitement inside the halls of the conference did not end with Mr. Kanaan's articulation.

As we went back to the press centre we were again taken by the special bus that had brought us to the palace. As before we were escorted by motorcycles that led the way. But this time they were making a lot more noise.

Madrid streets were jammed and our escorts wanted to break the deadlock. The Spanish soldier riding a motorcycle turned his siren on moved into the empty opposite land and we were escorted through the busy streets of Madrid like a presidential motorcade. For two of my fellow Palestinian journalists this was heaven on earth. A colleague, Jawdat Mana'a, joked out loud that if when he went back to Dheisheh camp near Bethlehem he would once again be restricted by an Israeli curfew or whether he could continue to bask in the freedom and exuberance he had felt as our bus was led freely through the streets of Madrid.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Mana'a was one of 13 Palestinian journalists who made an official request to interview Mr. Shamir in Madrid.

The Israeli refused to grant the interview saying that he might give an interview to Palestinians in Jerusalem. The problem and irony of course is that some of those Palestinian journalists are not allowed to enter Jerusalem for security reasons.



Hanan Ashrawi

motorcade turned his siren on moved into the empty opposite land and we were escorted through the busy streets of Madrid like a presidential motorcade. For two of my fellow Palestinian journalists this was heaven on earth. A colleague, Jawdat Mana'a, joked out loud that if when he went back to Dheisheh camp near Bethlehem he would once again be restricted by an Israeli curfew or whether he could continue to bask in the freedom and exuberance he had felt as our bus was led freely through the streets of Madrid.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Mana'a was one of 13 Palestinian journalists who made an official request to interview Mr. Shamir in Madrid.

The Israeli refused to grant the interview saying that he might give an interview to Palestinians in Jerusalem. The problem and irony of course is that some of those Palestinian journalists are not allowed to enter Jerusalem for security reasons.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Mana'a was one of 13 Palestinian journalists who made an official request to interview Mr. Shamir in Madrid.

The Israeli refused to grant the interview saying that he might give an interview to Palestinians in Jerusalem. The problem and irony of course is that some of those Palestinian journalists are not allowed to enter Jerusalem for security reasons.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Mana'a was one of 13 Palestinian journalists who made an official request to interview Mr. Shamir in Madrid.

The Israeli refused to grant the interview saying that he might give an interview to Palestinians in Jerusalem. The problem and irony of course is that some of those Palestinian journalists are not allowed to enter Jerusalem for security reasons.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Mana'a was one of 13 Palestinian journalists who made an official request to interview Mr. Shamir in Madrid.

The Israeli refused to grant the interview saying that he might give an interview to Palestinians in Jerusalem. The problem and irony of course is that some of those Palestinian journalists are not allowed to enter Jerusalem for security reasons.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Mana'a was one of 13 Palestinian journalists who made an official request to interview Mr. Shamir in Madrid.

The Israeli refused to grant the interview saying that he might give an interview to Palestinians in Jerusalem. The problem and irony of course is that some of those Palestinian journalists are not allowed to enter Jerusalem for security reasons.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Mana'a was one of 13 Palestinian journalists who made an official request to interview Mr. Shamir in Madrid.

The Israeli refused to grant the interview saying that he might give an interview to Palestinians in Jerusalem. The problem and irony of course is that some of those Palestinian journalists are not allowed to enter Jerusalem for security reasons.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Mana'a was one of 13 Palestinian journalists who made an official request to interview Mr. Shamir in Madrid.

The Israeli refused to grant the interview saying that he might give an interview to Palestinians in Jerusalem. The problem and irony of course is that some of those Palestinian journalists are not allowed to enter Jerusalem for security reasons.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Mana'a was one of 13 Palestinian journalists who made an official request to interview Mr. Shamir in Madrid.

The Israeli refused to grant the interview saying that he might give an interview to Palestinians in Jerusalem. The problem and irony of course is that some of those Palestinian journalists are not allowed to enter Jerusalem for security reasons.

Group says efforts on Mideast water will move ahead

By Carol Giacomo
Reuter

WASHINGTON — A group pushing for better development of water resources in the Middle East said it is still hoping to make progress even though a regional meeting it had organised on the issue was cancelled to avoid any conflict with the Madrid peace conference.

The so-called water summit was due to be hosted by Turkish President Turgut Ozal next week but officials feared it might interfere with the peace talks. The Madrid conference bringing together Israel and the Arabs opened Wednesday and water is among regional topics that could eventually be discussed.

Ms. Starr said the meeting was cancelled earlier this month at the request of the United States, which had feared it might conflict with the Madrid conference. The

State Department, however, denied playing a role in the cancellation.

Ms. Starr said her efforts were not intended to conflict with the peace conference and were begun long before the United States launched its peace initiative. The conference was expected to go more deeply into the water problems that some fear could spark a new Middle East war.

With so much ground laid, "we are going forward with plans for technical meetings and investment studies," she said.

"Our goal is to create a water security framework for the region which is a multi-year, very long-range, process," she said. One major goal is to coordinate information about research and development of desalination projects.

Ms. Starr said the meeting was cancelled earlier this month at the request of the United States, which had feared it might conflict with the Madrid conference. The

State Department, however, denied playing a role in the cancellation.

Ms. Starr said her efforts were not intended to conflict with the peace conference and were begun long before the United States launched its peace initiative. The conference was expected to go more deeply into the water problems that some fear could spark a new Middle East war.

With so much ground laid, "we are going forward with plans for technical meetings and investment studies," she said.

"Our goal is to create a water security framework for the region which is a multi-year, very long-range, process," she said. One major goal is to coordinate information about research and development of desalination projects.

Ms. Starr said the meeting was cancelled earlier this month at the request of the United States, which had feared it might conflict with the Madrid conference. The

State Department, however, denied playing a role in the cancellation.

Ms. Starr said the meeting was cancelled earlier this month at the request of the United States, which had feared it might conflict with the Madrid conference. The

State Department, however, denied playing a role in the cancellation.

Ms. Starr said the meeting was cancelled earlier this month at the request of the United States, which had feared it might conflict with the Madrid conference. The

JORDAN TIMES, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1991

More hostages to be freed 'despite Madrid talks'

BEIRUT (Agencies) — Pro-Iranian kidnappers will soon free more Western hostages held in Lebanon despite Tehran's fierce opposition to Middle East peace talks in Madrid, a Lebanese political source said Thursday.

"The Madrid conference and the harsh Iranian and Muslim (fundamentalists) position regarding it will not hamper efforts to end the hostage crisis," said the source, just back from talks with officials in Tehran.

"To the contrary, it will speed up the current process and more hostages will be freed very soon," he added.

China sold nuclear weapon know-how to Iran, officials inform U.S. committee

WASHINGTON (Agencies) — U.S. intelligence agencies have determined that China sold nuclear weapons technology to Iran despite repeated assurances that it would not export its nuclear know-how, administration officials have told a Senate panel.

"It appears that there is sale of some nuclear-related technologies" by the Chinese to Iran, Richard H. Solomon, an assistant secretary of state, said Wednesday.

Details of U.S. knowledge about the Chinese sale to Iran were secret, Mr. Solomon and a senior Pentagon official told the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific affairs.

They declined to provide specifics such as what equipment or materials Iran bought from China, in what quantities and when the United States learned of it.

The Washington Post in Thursday editions quoted a well placed U.S. official as saying the U.S. intelligence community told the Bush administration that China was assisting Iran's nuclear effort before last summer when senior administration officials said there was no evidence of it.

The otherwise unnamed official said the reports of a growing nuclear connection had been circulated among policymakers for several years, the Post reported.

The subcommittee later held a closed-door session to question Mr. Solomon and other administration officials about classified details of the China-Iran deal.

Subcommittee Chairman Alan Cranston (Democrat, California), and other panel members pressed Mr. Solomon in response to a story in Wednesday's editions of the Post in which unidentified administration officials were quoted as saying Iran had paid China millions of dollars for devices, called calutrons, which can be used to produce highly enriched uranium for a nuclear bomb.

Calutrons were invented in the United States as part of the crash effort to build a nuclear bomb during World War II. Today they are considered a primitive tech-

nology, and they have no use other than in nuclear weapons development.

The Post said officials described the equipment purchased by Iran as similar to calutrons discovered by United Nations inspectors in Iraq following the Gulf war. The inspectors have said documents found in Iraq indicate the Iraqis planned to use the calutrons to build nuclear bombs.

Reports that Iran may be trying to use Chinese technology to produce nuclear weapons were "utterly groundless," he said.

Iran's mission at the United Nations has also denied the reports.

Iran seeks return of arms

A senior Iranian official is visiting Turkey with a message from Iranian President Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani to his counterpart, Turgut Ozal, for the release of a shipload of arms seized in the Bosphorus on Oct. 22. The semi-official Anatolia news agency said.

Ali Reza Moayeri, Mr. Rafsanjani's adviser on international affairs confirmed on arrival that the message concerned the return of confiscated weapons.

"I suspect... we will find... that there are quite few countries involved, not just China," Mr. Solomon said. He did not name any other possible participants.

Sen. Joseph Biden, D-Delaware, told Mr. Solomon that as recently as last summer the administration had denied it had any indications that China was aiding Iran's nuclear programme.

China has cooperation with many countries, including Iran, in the field of the peaceful use of nuclear energy," Foreign Minister spokesman Wu Jianmin told a weekly news briefing.

"China strictly follows three principles in its nuclear exports.

First, it should only be used for peaceful purposes," he said.

"Secondly, China accepts the safeguards of the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency).

Thirdly, the recipient country should not transfer the nuclear

weapons.

"China has cooperation with many countries, including Iran, in the field of the peaceful use of nuclear energy," Foreign Minister spokesman Wu Jianmin told a weekly news briefing.

"China strictly follows three principles in its nuclear exports.

First, it should only be used for peaceful purposes," he said.

"Secondly, China accepts the safeguards of the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency).

Thirdly, the recipient country should not transfer the nuclear

weapons.

China has cooperation with many countries, including Iran, in the field of the peaceful use of nuclear energy," Foreign Minister spokesman Wu Jianmin told a weekly news briefing.

"China strictly follows three principles in its nuclear exports.

First, it should only be used for peaceful purposes," he said.

"Secondly, China accepts the safeguards of the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency).

Thirdly, the recipient country should not transfer the nuclear

Turkish raids threaten U.N. bid to resettle Kurds in northern Iraq

BARZAN, Iraq (R) — In the Barzan Valley of northern Iraq, Kurds who have recently returned from exile are talking of leaving again.

But it is not the Iraqi army that they fear.

The culprit this time is Turkey, which has sent its planes into northern Iraq to kill separatist Turkish Kurds in a series of raids that threaten to dash U.N. hopes of resettling Iraqi Kurds in their ancestral villages.

"People are afraid. Now they will go to the cities for the winter," said Kurdish engineer Tarag Naniq Aziz, who has been working on a U.N. shelter programme in the Barzan Valley.

Carlos Zaccagnini, and official in the U.N.'s Saqqi field office, went further.

"The shelter programme in Barzan Valley is dead for this winter," he told Reuters.

"People there have lost all sense of security. They see no point in staying the winter if they are going to be bombed."

The Barzan Valley, which runs east-west across northern Iraq, is the homeland of the Barzani clan, a major force in Kurdish nationalism.

But it has been virtually deserted since 1975 when the Iraqi government began destroying villages there.

The U.N., keen to encourage 1,200 recently returned families to settle permanently, has been providing materials for winter shelters.

But the latest Turkish raids, which began on Friday, have cast a shadow over the whole enterprise.

The Ankara government, which helped Washington and its Western allies protect Iraqi Kurds in the aftermath of the collapse of a post Gulf war rebellion, says its targets are separatist Kurds from southern Turkey.

But the latest Turkish raids, which began on Friday, have cast a shadow over the whole enterprise.

The Ankara government, which helped Washington and its Western allies protect Iraqi Kurds in the aftermath of the collapse of a post Gulf war rebellion, says its targets are separatist Kurds from southern Turkey.

war rebellion, says its targets are separatist Kurds from southern Turkey.

But the latest raids hit the villages of Iraqi Kurdish villages of Barzan, Bira Kapra and Rezan and A.U.N. shelter distribution point at Bile.

There were conflicting reports of casualties but Kurds said one civilian was killed and 14 wounded in the valley.

Tribal chieftain Sheikh Abdullah Barzani, who like many of the returnees lived in exile in Iran since 1975, has kept his family in a cave during the day since the attack.

The other warrants are for Abdullah Al Razagh, a Libyan diplomat in Brazzaville, Congo, where the bomb was allegedly planted, and two intelligence agents identified as Mr. Naeli and Mr. Arbas.

In addition, Investigating Judge Jean-Louis Bruguiere issued wanted notices for Libyan Vice-Foreign Minister Moussa Koussa and the number-three intelligence official, Abdul Salam Zadima.

The criminal documents will be transmitted via Interpol to Libyan law enforcement authorities. No arrests or extraditions are expected.

Specific charges were not issued, but all warrants are issued in connection with the Sept. 19, 1989 bombing of the DC-10 jetliner over a wide track of the Niger desert.

The warrants come four days after French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas urged the 12-nation European Community to lift sanctions adopted against Libya in 1986 for sponsoring "international terrorism."

Mr. Dumas was joined by Italy, Portugal and Spain. The European countries were meeting with five North African countries, including Libya.

The Turks did not say they were sorry," he added. "They could not tell me why Barzan was attacked."

But for Iraqi Kurds, the reasons for the attack do not seem to matter.

Mr. Bruguiere, and anti-terrorism specialist, has spent the past two years examining the wreckage and circumstances surrounding the blast.

"You can see that no one is coming here to pick up building supplies," he said disconsolately.

France issues warrant for Libyan officials

PARIS (AP) — A French judge issues international arrest warrants Wednesday against four Libyan officials, including Colonel Muammar Qaddafi's brother-in-law, for the bombing of a UTA jetliner over Niger in 1989 that killed 170 people.

Col. Qaddafi's brother-in-law, Abdulkhalid Senoussi, is considered to be the number-two leader of Libya's intelligence services.

The other warrants are for Abdulkhalid Al Razagh, a Libyan diplomat in Brazzaville, Congo, where the bomb was allegedly planted, and two intelligence agents identified as Mr. Naeli and Mr. Arbas.

In addition, Investigating Judge Jean-Louis Bruguiere issued wanted notices for Libyan Vice-Foreign Minister Moussa Koussa and the number-three intelligence official, Abdul Salam Zadima.

The criminal documents will be transmitted via Interpol to Libyan law enforcement authorities. No arrests or extraditions are expected.

Specific charges were not issued, but all warrants are issued in connection with the Sept. 19, 1989 bombing of the DC-10 jetliner over a wide track of the Niger desert.

The warrants come four days after French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas urged the 12-nation European Community to lift sanctions adopted against Libya in 1986 for sponsoring "international terrorism."

Mr. Dumas was joined by Italy, Portugal and Spain. The European countries were meeting with five North African countries, including Libya.

The Turks did not say they were sorry," he added. "They could not tell me why Barzan was attacked."

But for Iraqi Kurds, the reasons for the attack do not seem to matter.

Mr. Bruguiere, and anti-terrorism specialist, has spent the past two years examining the wreckage and circumstances surrounding the blast.

"You can see that no one is coming here to pick up building supplies," he said disconsolately.

"You can see that no one is coming here to pick up building supplies," he said disconsolately.



ANXIETY: Palestinian workers in a Jerusalem neighbourhood take time off to listen to radio broadcasting the Madrid peace conference

MIDDLE EAST NEWS IN BRIEF

Security tightened at Spanish Embassy

BEIRUT (R) — Police tightened security at the Spanish embassy in Beirut's eastern suburb of Hadeth Thursday after it was threatened by an anonymous telephone caller in connection with the Madrid peace talks. A police spokesman, who cannot be named in line with regulations, said a police force backed by an armoured personnel carrier was deployed near the entrance to the walled embassy early in the day. "We were informed that the Spanish embassy received a threat from an anonymous telephone caller in connection with the Madrid conference. We tightened security around the embassy in response," the spokesman said. The Spanish embassy withheld comment on the report. He said contacts were under way with other foreign embassies to "enquire if they want more security. The special (police) department in charge of providing diplomatic missions with protection has been reinforced," the spokesman said. The development came two days after a rocket was fired at the fence of the U.S. embassy in Beirut's northern suburb of Aukar. No casualties were reported. A previously unknown group, calling itself the Arab Revolutionary Front, has claimed responsibility for the rocket attack in a telephone call to news offices in Beirut and said it was staged to underscore opposition to the Arab-Israeli peace talks in Madrid.

Syrians rebuff reporters from Israel

MADRID (AP) — Syria has spurned several requests for interviews from Israeli reporters, striking a discordant note at a conference where Arabs and Israelis mingled in unprecedented fashion. Two Israeli reporters said they were turned away by the Syrian delegation without explanation. A third said he managed to interview a Syrian journalist, but only on condition of anonymity. Israeli officials have granted interviews to several dozen reporters from Arab lands and from Arab media in Europe. One official was interviewed by Saudi Arabia's state television, which has always censored any positive mention of the Jewish state. A Syrian official, declaring "I have my order," attempted to bar an Associated Press reporter from an informal briefing at the Syrian delegation press office. Ms. Stasi, who is based in Washington, had been issued credentials mistakenly saying she was based in Jerusalem. The official, who declined to provide his name, told another reporter the orders were not to allow Israelis into the Syrian delegation's press office.

U.S. bringing home armour from Saudi Arabia

LONDON (AP) — The United States has begun shipping home some armour equipment it had hoped to leave in Saudi Arabia as part of a bilateral prepositioning agreement. Jane's Defence Weekly reported the magazine said in its Nov. 2 issue that the two nations had been unable to agree on prepositioning since the Gulf war ended in March. It said this was due to Saudi concerns about leaving a permanent U.S. ground presence there. It reported: "approximately one million tons of military equipment deployed for the war is still scheduled to be shipped back to the U.S. It includes 1,300 tracked vehicles and 10,000 other vehicles. The former include M1, M1A1 and M60 tanks; Bradley fighting vehicles; M109 self-propelled howitzers; M88A1 medium recovery vehicles; M113 armoured personnel carriers, and M106 mortar carriers." The magazine, part of the Jane's publishing group whose annual volumes on fighting ships and other hardware are studied by defence forces around the world, gave no other details.

More oil wells to be controlled in Kuwait

KUWAIT CITY (AP) — Only nine out of the hundreds of oil wells set ablaze or destroyed in the Gulf war remain to be brought under control, oil officials said Thursday. One official, speaking on condition of anonymity, said six of the wells were on fire and the remaining three were gushing oil and needed to be capped. Firefighters hope to extinguish the last six fires today or tomorrow, said the official. "Then it should take them two or three days to cap them." He said a "ceremonial" well, Burhan 118, has been reignited and will be put out by the Kuwaiti firefighting team during a ceremony scheduled for next week the end of the firefighting effort. Kuwait's emir, Sheikh Jaber Al Ahmad Al Sabah, is expected to turn the valve that will secure the well. Of Kuwait's 940 producing wells, 732 were damaged, including 640 set ablaze. Original estimates called for capping the wells by March 1992. The faster rate was attributed to an increase in the number of firefighting companies, the availability of needed equipment and support, the completion of the water system and the growing experience of firefighters. Kuwait currently is producing about 290,000 barrels of oil a day from 120 intact wells. Output is expected to rise to about 400,000 barrels a day by the year's end and one million by July 1992.

Saudis may stop aid to Afghan rebels

ISLAMABAD (R) — Saudi Arabia may stop military aid to Afghan rebels to go along with a decision by the Soviet Union and the United States to halt arms supplies to Afghanistan on Jan. 1, a senior Soviet diplomat said on Wednesday. The United States and the Soviet Union agreed last month to halt all arms supplies to both sides in the war to help promote a United Nations peace plan. The United States has been the main source of arms supplies for the Mujahideen guerrillas in the 13-year-old civil war. Moscow has backed the Kabul government. Saudi Arabia, another major source of military aid to the Mujahideen, and Pakistan, which served as conduit for supplies to the rebels, have not formally joined the U.S.-Soviet agreement. "The Saudis have indicated that they are willing to go along with the negative symmetry," the Soviet diplomat said. "But there are private channels for money over which they (Saudi government) have an control." A major portion of Saudi military help for the Mujahideen came in cash. Recently, Saudi Arabia has given tanks, artillery and rockets captured from Iraq in the Gulf war. Saudi Ambassador Yusef Metabakani said in Islamabad on Wednesday that King Fahd had created a fund to rebuild areas destroyed by war, with an initial contribution of more than \$40 million, the official APP news agency said. It was not immediately clear if the fund would be used by the guerrillas or channelled through a U.N. programme for Afghan reconstruction. Mr. Metabakani gave Afghan rebel government President Mohammad Najibullah an additional 189 million rupees (\$7.7 million) for education facilities for refugee children in Pakistan, APP said.

Lawyers want to exhume Kahane's body

NEW YORK (AP) — A lawyer for El Sayyed Nosair, the man charged with the shooting death of militant Rabbi Meir Kahane, said he has sent a pathologist to Israel to get the victim's body exhumed and perform an autopsy. Attorney William Kumstler said he sent Dr. Werner Spitz to Israel because only a detailed autopsy will reveal whether the wound allegedly inflicted by Nosair caused the rabbi's death. "Our doctors have told me the wound is not fatal," Kumstler said. Because rabbi Kahane's family objected on religious grounds, city medical examiners did not do an invasive, comprehensive autopsy after the rabbi's death. Relying on an external autopsy, the medical examiner determined that the gunshot wound to the neck allegedly inflicted by Mr. Nosair killed rabbi Kahane. In court papers, assistant district attorney William Greenbaum said "the deceased suffered one bullet passing through his neck and head, causing damage consistent with the fatal injuries described in the medical reports." But defense lawyers said in the papers filed Tuesday that rabbi Kahane was "not shot through the head, but in the neck with the bullet exiting from the lower right cheek." It did not touch or even graze the brain pan. And, according to our forensic pathologist, might well have not been fatal if proper medical care had been provided or if the said victim had not been manhandled in the ambulance.